

eral policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

820. Also, petition of 846 Protestant, Jewish, and Catholic citizens of Bayonne, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States, for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

821. By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of George Gassner and other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging that we keep the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

822. Also, petition of Frank A. Schenk and other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging retention on the statute books of the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

823. Also, petition of Julia Zingsheim and others, of Rochester, N. Y., urging retention on the statute books of the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

824. Also, petition of Leo C. Fleming and other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging retention on the statute books of the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

825. Also, petition of Rev. Joseph T. Maloney and other citizens of Rochester, N. Y., urging retention on the statute books of the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include the civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

826. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of James F. Walsh and other residents of Greater New York, urging adherence to the present neutrality act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

827. Also, petition of 300 residents of Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Patman anti-chain-store bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

828. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of the Middlebury Post, No. 27, Department of Vermont, American Legion, favoring a complete revision of our national neutrality policy with a view to keeping our country out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

829. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Joseph W. Himpler and 21 interested persons of Downers Grove, Ill., recommending the adherence to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

830. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Cecilia Schoenherr, of Center Line, and 24 others, of Warren and Utica, Mich., extending the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, to include civil as well as international conflicts, and to retain on our statute books the principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

831. Also, petition of William Kelly and eight others, of Emmett and Goodells, Mich., extending the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, to include civil as well as international conflicts, and to retain on our statute books the principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

832. Also, petition of Albert Brennan and 10 others, of Avoca, Mich., extending the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, to include civil as well as international conflicts, and to retain on our statute books the principle enunciated in the act of March 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

833. Also, petition of Eva M. Cook and 22 others, of St. Clair Shores, Mich., extending the Neutrality Act of August

31, 1935, to include civil as well as international conflicts, and to retain on our statute books the principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

834. Also, petition of Rev. J. Henry Koelzer, pastor, SS. Peter and Paul Parish, North Branch, Mich., and 319 citizens of Lapeer, Sanilac, and Tuscola Counties, Mich., opposing the lifting of the embargo on exports of armaments to loyalist Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

835. Also, petition of Howard J. Clyne, attorney, and 20 others, of Yale, Mich., extending the Neutrality Act of August 31, 1935, to include civil as well as international conflicts, and to retain on our statute books the principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

836. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Petition of the Idaho State Legislature, stating the necessity for the conservation of water for use on irrigated tracts of the northwestern part of the United States through proper storage of water from the runoff seasons; further that the Mississippi is the subject of study for flood control; that a feasible plan for diversion of floodwaters from the Mississippi would be diversion of the Yellowstone Lake through a tunnel to the headwaters of the Snake River, thereby controlling such floodwaters, and not destroying any of the scenic beauty of Yellowstone Park, and providing water needed for irrigation; this memorial urges upon the Federal Government favorable consideration of legislation and appropriations necessary to carry to completion a project that will divert the water of the Yellowstone Lake to the headwaters of the Snake River; to the Committee on Flood Control.

837. Also, petition of the Lewiston Local Veterans of Industry, Lewiston, Idaho, memorializing Congress to exercise its constitutional mandate to coin money and regulate the value thereof, to establish a Government owned and controlled bank, recommending a program of consumption that will relieve actual need, requesting the passage of a land tenure law, and expressing support of loyalist Spain; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

838. By Mr. CORBETT: Petition of a number of voters of the Thirtieth District of Pennsylvania, requesting that Congress retain on the statute books the further and corollary act to include civil as well as international conflicts in regard to the neutrality act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

839. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Sepha Margulis, of the Bronx, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

840. Also, petition of C. A. Hixson, of Fortuna, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

841. Also, petition of the Townsend Club of Fortuna, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to General Welfare Act (H. R. 2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

842. Also, petition of Rev. F. Jos. Magri, D. D., and others, of Tidewater, Va., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

843. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to proposed legislation providing for creation of parks in Kings River Canyon and acquisition of additional lands for Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Orris Gravenor Robinson, of the Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

"God of grace and God of glory, on Thy people pour Thy power." On all Thy people, O God, pour Thy power—the rich and the poor, the wise and the unwise, the weak and the

strong, that all may be illumined and quickened to do Thy will.

We are thankful for the vision of the founders of this Nation, for their faith in the power of an omnipotent God. In this day of moral chaos may that vision be lengthened and broadened in these their followers, who have the moral responsibility for the welfare of our loved country.

Grant unto these, Thy servants, the representatives of the people of this Nation, not only insight but the moral courage to act as it is given them by Thee to act.

We thank Thee that Thy spirit still broods over Thy creation; that Thou dost not forsake the Nation that calls upon Thy name. Help us to remember that, though this Nation faces great and ominous problems, Thou art our God and we are Thy people.

Remember, O God, with comforting love the Representative of this body whose son was so suddenly taken from him this day, and forget not his family in their sorrow.

Hear our prayer, O God, we beseech Thee. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2762. An act to consolidate and codify the internal-revenue laws of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 13. An act for the relief of John Mulhern;

S. 60. An act for the relief of Dierks Lumber & Coal Co.;

S. 87. An act for the relief of Leslie Truax;

S. 90. An act to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen animals in interstate commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 92. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.;

S. 167. An act to amend clause (4b) of subsection (b) of section 203 of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935;

S. 185. An act to amend section 224 of the Criminal Code so as to penalize the making of false claims for the loss of insured mail matter;

S. 218. An act for the relief of Manuel D. A. Otero, as administrator of the estate of Teresita S. Otero, deceased;

S. 219. An act for the relief of Emma Gomez;

S. 313. An act to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Lester P. Barlow against the United States;

S. 323. An act for the relief of E. C. Beaver, who suffered loss on account of the Lawton, Okla., fire, 1917;

S. 342. An act for the relief of L. L. Stokes;

S. 470. An act for the relief of Alice Minnick;

S. 532. An act for the relief of Mabel Foote Ramsey, widow of William R. Ramsey, Jr., late special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice;

S. 760. An act for the relief of Mrs. Guy A. McConaha;

S. 766. An act for the relief of the Missoula Brewing Co.;

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution providing additional funds for the expenses of the special joint congressional committee investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution authorizing the holding of ceremonies in the rotunda in connection with the presentation of a statue of the late Will Rogers.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in regard to the lumber tariff and our foreign trade, and to include certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a very short editorial from the Rome News-Tribune, one of the leading papers of my State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

#### COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday and Wednesday the Committee on Accounts may be permitted to sit during sessions of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I presume this is agreeable to the ranking Republican member?

Mr. WARREN. I have not had an opportunity to talk with the ranking Republican member, but if it is not agreeable, we, of course, will not sit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on next Monday after disposition of the business on the Speaker's desk and the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE UN-AMERICAN PROPAGANDA AND ACTIVITIES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 26 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 26

*Resolved*, That the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Propaganda and Activities is authorized to continue the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress and shall report to the House as soon as practicable, but not later than January 3, 1941, the results of its investigations, together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 8, strike out "1941" and insert "1940."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, at this time against the resolution by virtue of the fact that according to Hinds' Precedents, 4403, when a select committee reports in full on the subject committed, it is thereby dissolved, but it may be revived by a vote.

There is one other way that the committee may be revived and that is if any new material had been referred to the committee previous to the time the committee was dissolved.

This committee was dissolved on January 3, 1939, and this resolution provides for a continuance of the committee. You cannot continue that which does not exist, and therefore the only way that this resolution could be considered would be by a direct vote on a revival of the committee and then an authorization for its continuance.

I therefore submit the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COX. The precedents of the House settle the point of order that has been raised. The pending resolution in form is the same as those heretofore employed in continuing committees that had expired by reason of the limitation as to time fixed in resolutions bringing them into being.



The meaning of this resolution is that the same committee heretofore functioning under the original resolution is revived with power in the Speaker, of course, to fill any vacancies that may exist.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman recognizes the fact that no point of order was raised against the resolution that we reported a couple of days ago on the matter of reorganization of the Government.

Mr. COX. The question was brought up and discussed and was met by an amendment that was offered. However, there is a long series of precedents upon identically the same point as the one that has been raised here.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan raises the point of order against the resolution on the grounds that the functions and authority conferred upon the select committee by the Seventy-fifth Congress have expired and therefore that the Rules Committee has no authority to report a resolution reviving and continuing the activities of that committee.

The Committee on Rules, of course, is a highly privileged committee. Under the rules of the House it has authority to report on matters of this character. As the Chair understands the resolution, reading the letter and the spirit of it, it provides not only for the continuance of the select committee appointed by virtue of the resolution of the Seventy-fifth Congress, but also for a revival of said committee. In other words, in the opinion of the Chair, the Committee on Rules has the authority, under the rules of the House, to breathe life into this select committee if they saw fit to do so and the resolution was approved by the House.

This is not a new matter. The Chair has not before it immediately the precedents, but in the Seventy-fourth Congress and in the Seventy-fifth Congress similar resolutions were presented. It has been held that the Committee on Rules has the power and jurisdiction to report resolutions similar in character and substance to this. As a matter of fact, the precedent cited by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook], section 4403, Hinds' Precedents, sustains the position which the Chair feels impelled to take. The Chair will re-read that:

When a select committee reports in full on the subject committed, it is thereby dissolved; but it may be revived by a vote.

As the Chair understands it, the purpose and object of this resolution is to revive this committee by a vote in the House. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, of the time in my control I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], to be in turn yielded by him as he desires.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I want to explain to the House that I have asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] to report this resolution. I am so vigorously opposed to the resolution that I cannot in good conscience report it myself. There are a number of other Members who have had no opportunity to be heard on this matter, who strongly desire to be heard, and I ask whether the gentleman who is in charge of the resolution will not agree to at least 1 hour for each side in order that all arguments can be brought before the House?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to make any agreement that would bind the House, but if any gentleman wishes to propound a unanimous-consent request, that would be a matter to be considered.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for consideration of the resolution be extended by 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between those for and those against the resolution.

The SPEAKER. And that the previous question shall be considered as ordered at the end of the 2 hours?

Mr. SABATH. Correct.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the time for debate upon the pending resolution may be extended 1 hour, so that there may be 2

hours of debate on the resolution, one-half of which shall be controlled by those in favor of the resolution and the remainder by those in opposition to the resolution, and that at the conclusion of the 2 hours of debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I have no objection to the extension of time. I think the control of the time, however, should be as usual, in charge of the majority side by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox], who has control of the resolution, and the minority member on this side, to dispose of as we see fit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to an equal division of the time as between those for and those against.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can only submit the unanimous-consent request in the terms in which it is offered.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object though I shall not do so. If the unanimous consent is granted, will that mean that the resolution is open to amendment?

The SPEAKER. It will not.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I wish to propose an amendment to this resolution.

Mr. COX. I regret that I shall not be in the position to yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman would read the amendment, I think that he would agree to it.

Mr. COX. I have read the amendment, and there is much in it that would be considered by the committee if it is revived.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why does not the gentleman permit me to offer this amendment to the resolution?

Mr. COX. I am sorry, but I cannot yield for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. In view of the fact that this matter has been under consideration for some time and that every Member of the House has made up his mind how he is going to vote, and that speech making would not change a single vote, I feel constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish anyone to feel that he has been denied the opportunity to express his views on the resolution. May not the gentleman from Illinois submit a request to extend the time for 1 hour? If the time is under my control I shall take pleasure in dividing it equally as between those for and those against.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I make that motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain such a motion. The Chair will entertain a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request and agree to the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] in respect to the control of the time.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KELLER. Do I understand that this resolution as proposed before this House this morning is not subject to amendment?

Mr. COX. Except upon motion of the committee. The committee will offer the amendment disclosed in the report, unless the previous question is voted down.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield with pleasure.

Mrs. NORTON. I would like to get some information about this.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, it is understood that this is not coming out of the time allowed the gentleman from Georgia?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the time is running.

Mr. COX. I will yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey, in any event.

Mrs. NORTON. My understanding is that this resolution cannot be amended. The only way it can be amended is to vote down the previous question. Then it will be subject to amendment. Am I right?

Mr. COX. That is correct, except as to amendments which the committee will offer.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move that the time be extended?

The SPEAKER. It would not be in order. The Chair cannot entertain a motion to extend the time, under the rules of the House.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time that has expired?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to be used by him as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to revive and continue the committee commonly known as the Dies committee, set up to investigate un-American activities. Your Committee on Rules held hearings, extending over 2 or 3 days, hearing every Member of the House who expressed a desire to be heard. A great many appeared and were given full latitude in setting forth their views. The committee came to the conclusion that the work which this investigating committee was set up to do had not been completed, that it was an important work, and that the investigation should be continued.

I do not believe there was a single witness—or, if one, not more than one or two—who opposed the continuation of the investigation. Those protesting the adoption of the resolution put their objections upon the ground that they were dissatisfied with the personnel of the committee as heretofore existing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say, while I am not here to insist that the committee exercised complete caution in the conduct of its investigation, yet at the same time I am not prepared to concede that the committee is subject to any of the criticism that has been directed against it. I think the committee has been very grossly misrepresented and has been unjustly criticized.

Those objecting have taken the position that the committee has not sat as a purely judicial body, and that they have not observed the strict rules of evidence in receiving testimony. I take it, Mr. Speaker, that the committee is not expected to function as a strictly judicial body, nor is it expected to rigidly observe rules of evidence in the taking of testimony. The chief criticism directed against the committee is that it has permitted people with grievances to appear before the committee and to take advantage of that appearance to direct unfair charges against people throughout the country. I think, Mr. Speaker, that has been done, but I do not consider that the committee is chargeable with the duty of verifying the truthfulness of what is to be said before a witness testifies. The committee, I believe, has endeavored to be fair. Certainly, in the light of the criticism that has been made and the experience had, the committee, if re-created and permitted to continue the investigation, will avoid repetition of any mistakes and will escape the criticism that has heretofore been leveled against it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in view of the limited time that is allowed for debate, and due to the further fact there are many who would like to register their views on this resolution, I have requested very little time to discuss it myself.

It seems to me that the type and character of the opposition to the Dies committee is perhaps the strongest argument and recommendation for its continuation. I realize there are a great many well-intentioned people who have been misled by false and sinister propaganda, who perhaps feel that this committee has abused some of its prerogatives,

but the bulk of the opposition that has been registered against this committee comes from well-known and well-recognized un-American activities throughout this country. From the very outset it has been apparent that an insidious conspiracy was afoot to discredit this committee. In the first instance, they attempted to ridicule it out of existence. Then they resorted to laughter, and finally when they could not win their objective by those methods, they proceeded to smear the committee by abuse, misrepresentation, and billingsgate.

Now, this has not been confined alone to the un-American organizations of this country. Some of the outstanding executive figures of this administration have condescended to resort to tactics in this respect which seem to me beneath the dignity of such figures, attempting to bring this committee into disrepute.

So far as I know, this is the first instance where a special committee of the Congress has been assailed and assaulted by an official of the executive department of the Government. To me this is a very sad and melancholy commentary, and as a rebuke to this reprehensible spectacle this resolution ought to be adopted by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time within the past few days that resolutions have been brought here to extend special committees, and in both of the other instances this House has adopted those resolutions without a dissent. So, Mr. Speaker, why all this hub-bub and commotion and opposition to the Dies committee? Of course, you all know the answer. The answer is that this investigation has "got under the skin" of those subversive influences and their sympathizers who would sabotage the hallowed institutions of our Government and erect on their ruins a system of government of a foreign pattern. After all, Mr. Speaker, the only difference between ultra-liberalism and communism is one of degree. If you will visit the offices of the Rules Committee and see the avalanche of telegrams, letters, and post cards that were sent this committee by so-called liberals protesting this resolution, you will have some conception and appreciation of the apprehension which the advocates and sympathizers of these un-American philosophies entertain if this committee is continued. The verity of the old adage that it is always the "hit dog that howls" has been abundantly demonstrated by the bitter fight that has been waged against this resolution. For 3 days so-called liberals of the House used the Rules Committee as a sounding board for their lurid protestations. They clearly showed by their testimony that it was the scalp of MARTIN DIES that they sought, and that nothing short of that would satisfy them.

The methods employed by these radical agents and organizations to discredit the so-called Dies committee has in some instances been both pitiful and ludicrous. For instance, they put out the perfectly amusing story that the committee had charged Shirley Temple with being a Communist. That, of course, was nonsensical to the point of absurdity. Recently, in a further attempt to discredit the committee, they claimed that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was trying to elect himself President of the United States and wanted to use this \$100,000 or \$150,000 to advance his candidacy. Of course, I do not know just what ambitions the distinguished gentleman from Texas may entertain, but so far as that is concerned, I think MARTIN DIES would make a better President than some I have seen since I came to Washington 20 years ago—and I do not have in mind Herbert Hoover when I say that. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I myself have had some experience on special committees to investigate un-American activities. I had the honor of serving with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] on the Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities during the Seventy-third Congress, and I know something of the difficulties and embarrassments which confront committees to investigate these subversive influences. An attempt was made to lambast us and lampoon us, but not to the extent that we witnessed with the Dies committee, because there has been no limit to the abuse and vituperation that has been heaped



upon this committee. In my judgment, it has been wholly unjustified. [Applause.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that to vote down this resolution can only mean a repudiation of this able and courageous committee. It will be hailed with a great hal-luhah by every "red" organization in this country, together with their adherents and sympathizers. So far as I am concerned, I refuse to give them this comfort and consolation. I refuse to believe that this House with its proud and illustrious traditions will consent to "run out" on a committee of its own creation—a committee which it is now proposed to crucify because it showed courage and determination in its efforts to expose radicalism in our midst. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia that he ask unanimous consent that those who speak have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there is evident a desire on the part of the Members to express themselves, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on this resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as has been previously stated, this is a resolution to continue for 1 year the special committee, commonly known as the Dies Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. You will remember 1 year ago the great majority of the Members of this House were of the opinion that there were too much un-American activities in this country. We were of the opinion that something should be done. Accordingly, a resolution similar to the one before us was presented. In compliance with it Speaker BANKHEAD named this special committee which was composed of five Democratic Members and two Republican Members. In the selection of this committee Speaker BANKHEAD was very careful and particular. For chairman he selected an outstanding and lifelong Democrat from Texas, Mr. DIES, a Member who has served with distinction in this body for 8 years, an individual that has the respect of every Member of Congress, by reason of his fearlessness, honesty, and ability. Mr. HEALY, of Massachusetts; Mr. DEMPSEY, of New Mexico; and Mr. STARNES of Alabama, present Members of this House, were also appointed by the Speaker to this committee. There is one vacancy. All of these Members are outstanding Members. They have served the Democratic Party with distinction for many years. They are not new Members of this body. The Speaker, in selecting them, knew them well. Mr. BANKHEAD selected them because he knew they were fearless, because he knew them to be honest, because he knew they would use every honest effort to lessen the un-American activities in this country. Speaker BANKHEAD is no novice in the art of selecting committees. He has performed that duty before, and we all admit that he has always done a very good job. What I have stated about the Democratic Members applies equally to the two Republicans on this committee.

My reason in discussing the membership of this committee is this: For the past 3 days certain Members of Congress have come before the Rules Committee attacking the sincerity and the honesty and integrity of the membership of this special committee. Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York; Mr. VOORHIS of California; Mr. KELLER, of Illinois; and others, have come before the Rules Committee emphasizing that Mr. DIES, Mr. DEMPSEY, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, and others, did not possess the necessary sense of equality and sound judgment. They declared in no uncertain terms that these members of their own party did not have judicial minds and were intemperate in their actions. They stressed that Mr. DIES and others had been working for the benefit of the

Republican Party and to the detriment of the Democratic Party and its various candidates. They harshly criticized every action of this committee. The hearings before the Rules Committee totaled approximately 7 hours. Opponents of this resolution were allotted approximately 6 hours of the 7 hours. Eight Members of Congress were heard against the resolution. Mr. DIES was the only one heard in favor of it. At the conclusion 13 out of the 14 members of the Rules Committee favored the passage of this resolution.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KELLER. Does the gentleman mean to say we said that about the committee or about the chairman of the committee?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that implications were made in regard to all of the members of the committee.

Mr. KELLER. I deny the inference. I said that about the chairman, not about the committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. All right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman think that what this committee is investigating now, namely, whether there is communism in this country and whether it is spreading, is known to every man and woman throughout the United States without any investigation? Does not the gentleman believe that if this investigation is to be carried on, the causes of communism and its spread should be inquired into as well as the question of whether or not they exist?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think the committee are doing a good job.

I readily admit that this committee has not functioned 100 percent. What committee ever does? I personally did not agree with the La Follette committee when they confiscated private telegrams and correspondence. In my opinion, the few omissions of this committee can be attributed to lack of funds. Well do I remember a year ago, when this committee came before the Accounts Committee, of which I am a member, requesting \$100,000 to properly carry on its work. By reason that it was generally understood the various departments were to come to the aid of the Dies committee, giving clerical help and investigators, the committee was given \$25,000 instead of \$100,000. Then what happened? Mr. DIES wrote respectful letters to the various departments requesting help, but was refused this necessary aid. Even before the committee had any hearings Cabinet members and others high in official life in Washington began an attack of vilification. Every effort was made to ridicule the work of the committee in the eyes of the public. Mr. DIES stood for these malicious attacks for several months and then, like the true he-man that he is, did a little "snipe" shooting himself. In other words, he took to the radio to justify the work of the committee and to defend it against these unjust and unwarranted assaults.

Much was said before the Rules Committee by Mr. MARCANTONIO, of New York; Mr. VOORHIS of California; Mr. KELLER, of Illinois, that the Dies committee worked for the benefit of the Republican candidates and to the detriment of the Democratic candidates for office during the 1938 elections. I interrogated Mr. DIES on that subject and he emphasized that nothing political entered the committee's work. Any contention that these five lifelong Democrats would be working for the Republican candidates for office is totally absurd. In support of its absurdity I would mention this: I hold here an article written by George E. Reedy, special Washington correspondent to the Philadelphia Inquirer. In the February 2, 1939, issue of that paper it states:

Speaker WILLIAM BANKHEAD (Democrat, Alabama) announced that if the investigation was continued the present Members would be reappointed.

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, if you believe that Speaker BANKHEAD would want to reappoint the present committee if

he believed it to be working for the benefit of Republican candidates for office and to the detriment of Democratic candidates?

This resolution should unanimously pass in order that those individuals and those organizations whose intentions are to overthrow our American system of government will know, and know well, that we in Washington will use every means to defeat their purposes; that we in Washington stand ready to fight to the last those who wish to assault our American principles and American institutions.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now control only 13 minutes, and there are about 25 requests for time. Therefore, I will take just a few minutes myself in order to leave a minute here and there for other Members who wish to be heard against the resolution.

For 32 years it has been my contention that Members of this House should have the privilege given them in the Constitution of voting on bills and resolutions, rather than having legislation buried in committees. I have likewise always insisted that Members be given a fair and equal chance to state their position and express themselves on legislation before the House. That conviction has guided me in my consideration of the resolution now before us. Insisting that those in favor of it have the right to be heard, I reserve the right to speak against it.

I maintain that the special committee created by the original resolution, for which I voted in a firm belief that there should be a thorough investigation of un-American activities, has used the prestige of this Congress to become a medium for partisan attacks upon the Democratic administration, members of the Cabinet, organized labor, and many respected and outstanding citizens. The gentleman from Tennessee stated that the special committee had been smeared. If anyone was undeservedly smeared it was the thousands of loyal and patriotic American citizens who were given no slight opportunity to defend themselves before this committee. I have in my possession as chairman of the Committee on Rules thousands of telegrams and letters from preachers, teachers, organized labor leaders, civic leaders, public officials, veteran leaders, and others against whose organizations and themselves the most vicious insinuations have been made by unreliable and discredited investigators and witnesses of the special committee. I say the use of a congressional committee to give credence and publicity to such baseless charges has been unfair to these thousands of Americans and their organizations. Unfortunately, from the very outset this committee has been led astray and has given widespread publicity to charges made by men who have been later discharged by the committee itself because it was learned that these persons were untrustworthy and undeserving of belief.

Mr. Speaker, for reasons unknown to me, the majority of the Rules Committee have seen fit to disregard the storm of protest raised against continuation of the committee and, ignoring the thousands of pleas for a sober, careful, and deliberate consideration of the resolution now before us, they have insisted upon a hasty and, to my mind, ill-considered report and vote by the House. Even my suggestion that the committee's membership be increased to avoid repetition of the charge of one-man dictatorship was rejected by the gentleman from Texas and a majority of the Rules Committee for reasons I cannot ascertain. I think increased membership would be a healthy thing for the committee and help accomplish all the work the chairman says is unfinished. Is it possible that increased membership might upset the program that the committee has already planned in advance of the action of the House in continuing it?

In all my congressional experience of 32 years, I know of no committee so broadly condemned because of its conduct by people in all stages of life and from all parts of the Nation. No one denies the necessity for a complete investigation into un-American activities as was contemplated when the Congress originally created this committee. But thousands of reliable and outstanding people insist that the committee has been solely a medium to smear political and civic leaders whose views, while being far from communistic, differ from

those of the chairman of the committee. I recall a proposal often made by a gentleman in this House in the cloakroom that a demagogue club be formed in Congress and he be the president. I thought this was just humor, but I am seriously wondering now if it was not meant in dead earnest. Certainly thousands of law-abiding citizens and liberal-minded and progressive people who support the President, and even the President himself, have been exposed to the rankest kind of demagoguery by the actions of this committee. And not only that, but in every section of the country Democratic candidates for high office have been falsely and maliciously accused of communistic alignments without a shred of evidence or justification for such baseless charges. Men made these charges while on the pay roll of a committee of Congress and who were later found to be labor spies connected with strikebreaking organizations and groups specializing in the lowest type of character assassination; men whose recklessness with the truth and general unreliability should have been ascertained by the special committee before they were permitted to fill hundreds of pages of the record with their outrageous charges and statements. This was bad enough, but when the special committee permitted itself to be used to allow veiled insinuations against the President to be made, their conduct not only disgusted but was resented by millions of fair-minded citizens of our country.

There is no need to explain why the Republicans favor continuation of the committee. I notice that they are unanimous in their support of this resolution and will undoubtedly vote for it to a man. I cannot wholly blame them for this strictly partisan attitude of utilizing the best opportunity they have had in years for what they hope will continue to cast discredit upon the Democratic Party, its officials, and a Democratic President. But I regret extremely that the Democrats are so short-sighted as to permit themselves to be used for such an unsavory purpose and to have Democratic legislators go to the extent of even refusing a fair chance and opportunity to Members of this House to express their views and submit evidence as to why this instrument of attack on organized labor and the Democratic Party should be stopped now.

Mr. Speaker, I originally supported and voted for the resolution that created this special committee in the belief that I was helping to bring about a real investigation of all the un-American and subversive activities in this country. I was therefore amazed to find out during the course of the hearings before the Committee on Rules that little or none of the original intent of the House had been carried out. Instead I became convinced that this committee had spent its time and money on little less than a "smeared campaign" against all who have tried to promote liberal government and aid in supporting the great humanitarian principles of your President and mine. What about un-American organizations that spread bigotry, class prejudice, and racial hatred throughout this fair land of ours? Were they investigated by the committee? Was there any attempt made to find out who finances them and for what purpose? Was Mr. Pelley, of North Carolina, and his Silver Shirts, subpoenaed and investigated? Was the Republican candidate for Governor of Kansas, Mr. Winrod, investigated? Was Fritz Kuhn brought in and investigated? Were the Black Shirts of Michigan investigated? Oh, no; the committee could not get around to them before their money ran out, and I am wondering why.

It is a strange and distressing coincidence that the enemies of President Roosevelt and the administration will stop at nothing and use any kind of instrument at hand to undermine and try to destroy the confidence of our people in the administration. This is not the first time it has been tried, but it will fail like the others when the people realize who and what is back of these vicious smearing campaigns. How very much like the campaign against our American President now being carried in the Nazi press in Germany, how nearly in the same language are these vicious attacks by the agents of fascism, silver shirtism, nazi-ism, and other "isms" which are given credence and publicity by our ill-advised and misguided special committee. Only today newspapers



report our President being called a "Bolshevist tool." Read the special committee's hearings and the press reports about them and see if that does not sound to you like the ravings now being carried in the Hitler press. The headlines in reactionary newspapers accompanying every hearing of this special committee have echoed in substance the vituperations of the German Nazis directed against our great President. I know the administration would not have uttered one word of criticism of the committee if it had felt its work and real purpose was to investigate and expose un-American activities, instead of attacking, libeling, and attempting to intimidate every liberal, progressive, and humanitarian group and person in sympathy with the objectives of our administration to better the conditions and lives of the masses of our people.

History repeats itself sometimes, and I know the future will justify my position and that of all others in this House who refuse to submit to partisan prejudice and political hysteria. No number of attacks on the President and his administration, no matter how cleverly masqueraded or concealed, will detract from his fine reputation and the noble and humane efforts he is making in behalf of our democratic form of government and especially in behalf of the needy and downtrodden for whose condition the greedy and avaricious special interests are responsible and whose agents howl gleefully at every attempt to smear him or those who support him.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that neither my conscience nor my sense of decency will permit me to vote for this resolution. I take the privilege under the leave granted me of inserting a few of the thousands of letters and telegrams which I have received in protest to continuing this special committee, at this point in the RECORD. These protests should satisfy any fair-minded Member that I am doing my duty in opposing the passage of this resolution. I hope, even in spite of my fears, that if the special committee is renewed, it will see a new light and sincerely try to do the job it was intended to do. But like the thousands who oppose its continuance, I go only by its past record, and I urge the Democrats of this House as good Democrats, to put an end to this partisan and political comedy by voting with me against the resolution.

The letters follow:

GRAND LODGE BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,  
Cleveland, Ohio, January 9, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I take this opportunity to call to your attention the fact that the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is unalterably opposed to the granting of any additional money to the disreputable Dies committee. That committee should be discharged at once and the task of investigating un-American activity be delegated to Congressmen and Senators of the caliber of the members of the Senate Civil Liberties Committee.

Without listing a separate bill of complaint against the Dies committee the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen endorses President Roosevelt's indictment of the unfair and un-American tactics employed by that committee throughout the course of its investigation and hearings.

With the danger of fascism present and immediate, we cannot afford to be blinded by a smoke screen of unfounded charges and scare headlines emanating from the star chamber of the Dies committee. I for one hope that the House of Representatives will regain the respect of the American citizenry by refusing to countenance further the antics of the Dies committee.

Respectfully yours,

A. F. WHITNEY, President.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., January 9, 1939.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
House Office Building:

We urge you to oppose resolution for continuance of un-American Dies committee.

INDIANA CIVIL RIGHTS COMMITTEE,  
FRANCES ZINKIN, Secretary.

KANSAS CITY, MO., January 6, 1939.

The Honorable ADOLPH SABATH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:

Congressman DIES and his committee have failed to investigate the case of Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, of Kansas, and numerous other pro-Nazi and anti-Semitic groups. While an objective investiga-

tion of Nazi, Fascist, and Communist groups in the United States is a crying need, it would be a tragedy to carry on that investigation as the Dies committee has proceeded.

Rev. L. M. BIRKHEAD,  
National Director, Friends of Democracy.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,  
SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS,  
Syracuse, N. Y., January 19, 1939.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman of the Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: This is to protest against continuance of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as provided in the resolution introduced by Representative DIES, of Texas. I hope that those thoughtful citizens who enter protests will be regarded by yourself and colleagues as representative of a larger number who feel such opposition but who have not been moved to write or wire by cleverly conducted campaigns of misrepresentation. Up to date it appears that the Dies committee has confused the real issues and perhaps hampered the work of agencies charged with apprehension of spies and other foreigners guilty of real offenses; it has besmirched the names of leading and patriotic citizens for the sake of political capital and generally contributed to mob hysteria rather than to sound democratic government.

Respectfully yours,

DOUGLAS G. HARING.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., January 30, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
Washington, D. C.:

Petition containing over 80 signatures Louisiana citizens requesting that further committee action upon appropriations for Dies committee be delayed forwarded today to chairman, House Rules Committee.

JAMES DAVID McNEILL.

PORTLAND, OREG., January 27, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman, Rules Committee,  
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge your committee recommend no appropriation for Dies committee, whose alleged investigations have degenerated into New Deal smearing, and threaten future of American democracy.

R. E. SHERIFF,  
President, Council for Economic and Social Research.

SOUTH BEND INDUSTRIAL UNION COUNCIL,  
South Bend, Ind., January 31, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are enclosing a resolution adopted by the South Bend Industrial Union Council, representing 25,000 members of organized labor, at our last regular meeting.

Since from the very outset the Dies committee has done nothing constructive, but, instead, has attacked everything progressive and constructive, as is outlined in the enclosed resolution, we therefore urge that the Rules Committee refuse to act favorably on the Dies committee resolution asking for an additional \$150,000 to continue their destructive work.

Respectfully yours,

BESS MEHLIN,  
Executive Secretary.

#### THE UN-AMERICAN DIES COMMITTEE

Whereas the Dies committee was authorized by the Seventy-fifth Congress to investigate "subversive and un-American activities"; and

Whereas so scandalous was the mud slinging of the committee that President Roosevelt rebuked it publicly on October 25, ironically dubbing it an "un-American committee"; and

Whereas from the first days of its hearings, the committee began a Nation-wide "red hunt" with sweeping assaults on members of the Cabinet and liberal New Dealers, provocative charges against the C. I. O., demands for deportation of trade-union leaders, slanders against the private life of the Roosevelt family; and

Whereas the American people observed that the new revelations (equal in importance to the discovery that Shirley Temple was a dangerous "red") always seemed to be timed for publication with an eye for maximum effect in the elections in such key States as Michigan, Minnesota, New York, and California; and

Whereas New Deal democracy, the modern labor movement launched by the C. I. O., and the popular will of the people are the real targets of the Dies committee and the reactionary strategists behind it; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the South Bend Industrial Union Council go on record condemning the Dies committee and call on our Congressmen to carry out the following action:

1. No appropriations to the Dies committee.
2. Ask its dissolution by the House of Representatives.
3. Appointment of a committee to study and investigate the finances, procedures and un-American recommendations of Mr. DIES and his associates; and be it finally

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen, to all unions affiliated to the council, to members of the State legislature, and to the press.

BESS MEHLIN, *Secretary.*

AUSTIN, TEX., January 9, 1939.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
Oppose continuation of Dies committee un-American activities as un-American in procedure and spirit. Also as waste of public funds badly needed for other purposes.

Rev. S. MARCUS HOUGE,  
*State Chairman, Civil Liberties Committee.*

NEW HAVEN, CONN., January 25, 1939.

THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE,  
*Washington, D. C.:*  
Labor's Non-Partisan League feels that the appropriation for the Dies committee should not be extended. The investigation has not only been a farce but has been aimed at the entire labor movement.  
CALVIN SUTHERLIN,  
*Labor's Non-Partisan League of Connecticut.*

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 10, 1939.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
Wish to record my opposition to continuation of Dies House committee with its lax, unscholarly, and unscientific methods of investigating un-American activities. Believe it has been used for political purposes rather than for real purpose for which it was set up.

FREDERICK L. REDEFER,  
*Executive Secretary, Progressive Education Association.*

COLUMBUS, OHIO, January 9, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
Record of Dies committee insuring irresponsible witnesses and refusing hearing to those accused conclusively shows this committee a menace to democratic procedure and government. Urge discontinuance this un-American committee.

R. E. MATHEWS,  
*Secretary, Ohio League for Constitutional Rights.*

PHILADELPHIA, PA., January 11, 1939.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, House Rules Committee, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:*  
American Federation of Teachers, representing more than 30,000 teachers, affiliated with American Federation of Labor, urges discharge of Dies committee on basis inaccurate statements, poor conduct hearings, failure to fulfill real purpose for which set up. We oppose further appropriations to such committee.

MARY FOLEY GROSSMAN,  
*National Legislative Representative.*

NEW ORLEANS, LA., January 30, 1939.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*Chairman of the Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
The conduct of the inquiry of the House Committee on Un-American Activities has so clearly revealed the prejudice of the committee that there is no justification for extending the inquiry. I urge, therefore, an adverse report on the Dies resolution.

ELIZABETH PORTER.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 25, 1939.

Representative A. J. SABATH,  
*Chairman of Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
May I add my voice to what must be a rapidly growing protest at continuance of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities. Investigate un-Americanism, yes, but not through a committee headed by one whom I consider un-American and containing members whose Americanism is, to say the least, questionable.

Respectfully,

MANCHESTER, VT.

WILLIAM M. WHEELS.

GRINNELL, IOWA, January 23, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
Do your best to kill resolution appropriating more money for Dies committee. That committee is a national disgrace, accepting emotional statements without investigating their truth.

Mrs. LAETITIAM CONARD.

PAWLING, N. Y., January 21, 1939.

Representative A. J. SABATH,  
*House Office Building:*  
Urge adverse action on continuation Dies committee as sensational and unauthentic in method and intent.

M. F. TABER.

WINNETKA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,  
Winnetka, Ill., January 21, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, Rules Committee, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:*  
DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: I understand that the Dies committee has asked for an appropriation of \$150,000 to continue its absurd investigation. Haven't we enough faith in democracy and in the common sense of the American people not to be afraid of the sputtering of a few thousand Communists and Fascists? It seems to me that there are far too many things that need money to waste our resources on this sort of futile investigation. It makes good headlines for Mr. Dies, but he and the other Congressmen can serve our country better by working on the really serious problems that confront us, and not wasting their time and the taxpayers' money on witch hunts. If there are actual criminal conspiracies, let our very efficient G-men ferret them out under the Department of Justice, instead of dragging citizens before a congressional committee to explain why they have exercised their rights as citizens in a free country in belonging to various organizations or expressing their opinions.

Thomas Jefferson once said: "Here we shall follow truth wherever it may lead, nor fear to tolerate error as long as reason is left free to combat it." That is the essence of democracy and of faith in the democratic process. Dies investigations smack of the Stalin purges and the Hitler persecutions. They are far more un-American than the activities of those whom he "exposes." I trust that you and the members of your committee will have more respect for American democracy than would be implied by an appropriation to "red" baiters and Fascist baiters.

Yours truly,

CARLETON WASHBURN.

CHICAGO, ILL., January 7, 1939.

Congressman A. J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, Rules Committee, House of Representatives,  
House Office Building:*  
I want to protest against the continuance of the silly performance of the Dies committee, and quote for you from an editorial in New York Times: "The committee has solemnly listened to a great deal of obviously hysterical tosh. Its chairman's conclusions have usually been reached in advance of its evidence and have nearly always been more sweeping than its evidence justified. It has been genuinely guilty of 'red' baiting in the sense of overzealousness to pin a Communist label on every species of liberal thought." It has made silly and vehement charges against several members of the Cabinet. In short, it has sometimes brought itself into deserved ridicule, and in doing so has endangered the very cause to which it supposes itself to be devoted."

JOHN A. LAPP.

EVANSTON, ILL., January 29, 1939.

Representative A. J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
As individuals who are native-born Americans and voting citizens of Illinois anxious to preserve the liberties and rights traditional to the United States, we strongly urge your committee report adversely the Dies resolution for continuing the House Committee on Un-American Activities. This committee has already seriously injured American unity by engendering further discords. Its unjudicial and superficial attitude and irresponsible publicity merit its permanent disbandment not only in the interests of economy but especially of preserving the spirit of democracy, fairness, and freedom of the Nation.

C. C. Arndt, G. E. Axtelle, O. J. Baab, Russell Babcock, Lester Ball, Wade Barclay, C. H. Behre, Jr., David Cameron, A. A. Campbell, G. R. Bayard, R. W. Cossum, James Cotter, J. B. Crane, George Davis, Russell Dick, J. C. Eberhart, T. D. Eliot, Cortland Eyre, William Gellermann, J. T. Goodrich, Kay C. Goodrich, W. E. J. Gratz, Leon Green, H. C. Heffner, Joel D. Hunter, E. S. Lawler, M. H. Leiffer, C. D. MacDougall, E. T. McSwain, George M. Miller, Paul S. Minear, Lester Mondale, J. L. Moss, Ralph M. Phelps, H. F. Rall, Alpheus Smith, Ernest F. Tittle, William Voas, Carleton Washburne, I. G. Whitchurch, Robert Watrous, J. E. Whitesell, R. E. Wolseley, M. J. Herskovits, Whit Brogan, B. H. Morris.

YALE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW,  
New Haven, Conn., January 31, 1939.

The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
*Chairman, Committee on Rules, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.:*  
DEAR SIR: I do not often write letters to committee chairmen telling them what I think. Even now I do so with some hesitation.



It has, however, struck me, after long consideration of the question, that the Dies committee did not reflect credit on the House of Representatives. It was quite appropriate to investigate un-American activities, but the methods pursued were not calculated to promote the prestige of the House. There is a strong feeling that Mr. Dies does not have the judicial temperament to conduct such an investigation, although I do not have the pleasure of knowing him personally.

If the investigation is to be continued, therefore, might it not be preferable in the interests of everybody to elect a chairman who is judicially minded and who has as few preconceptions as possible? The committee led by Mr. Dies apparently arouses so much hostility as to weaken both its standing and its function. I do not know whether this opinion is justified by the facts, but I feel confident that it is widespread.

Very respectfully yours,

EDWIN M. BORCHARD.

HARVEY, ILL., January 31, 1939.

Congressman SABATH.

DEAR SIR: We wish to inform you that our organization wishes that no further funds be appropriated for the Dies committee.

LABOR'S NONPARTISAN LEAGUE,  
Thornton Township Branch.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,  
Carbondale, Ill., January 31, 1939.

The Honorable ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
United States House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The investigations of the Dies committee on un-American activities have brought down the indignation of all fair-minded citizens. The committee has worked ineptly and illogically; it has failed to seek complete or authoritative evidence; it has accepted much invalid testimony, and has ignored sound refutations of certain of the matter presented. It has furthermore earned by its blatancy a most unsavory notoriety.

I sincerely urge you, as chairman of the Rules Committee, not to recommend continuance of this extravagant enterprise but to appropriate our money rather for the countless worthy claims upon Government funds. The Dies proceedings have already abused public support for far too long a time. Let them now be discontinued, now that the opportunity is offered.

Yours in the name of decency and dignity,

MADELEINE M. SMITH.

THE PATERSON TEACHERS' UNION, LOCAL 482,  
Paterson, N. J., January 31, 1939.

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to inform you that the Paterson Teachers' Union, Local 482, voted to request an adverse report on the Dies resolution, which is before your committee at this time. It is the opinion of our organization that the prejudice, unjudicial conduct, and irresponsibility, which characterize the investigations of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, demand that its inquiry be discontinued.

We therefore urge that the Rules Committee report unfavorably on the resolution to extend the work of the Dies committee.

Very truly yours,

MOLLIE PLUHA,  
Legislative Committee.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 30, 1939.

A. J. SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Speaking on behalf large number of persons misrepresented by Dies committee report, we urge Rules Committee to hold a hearing on continuance that committee's work, believing that prestige of Congress and principle of fair play both demand that any such inquiry be entrusted to more competent and less biased group.

ARTHUR GARFIELD HAYS,  
General Counsel, American Civil Liberties Union.

CANTON, OHIO, January 20, 1939.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,  
House Office Building:

It is time to stop the burlesque show of Representative Dies before he indicts Snow White and the seven dwarfs.

RALPH S. COOK.

DURHAM, N. C., January 29, 1939.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman of the Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

(Personal.) Many liberal southerners urge your committee discontinue funds for Dies committee at least until full report published. This committee, ruled by Republicans, should be abolished.

MALCOLM M. YOUNG.

LXXXIV—70

SIMPSON COLLEGE,  
Indianola, Iowa, January 30, 1939.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman of the Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SABATH: I am writing you in regard to the continuation and appropriation for the Dies committee. As an interested citizen, I am very much opposed to the work of that committee in the past. It has seemed to me that their work has not only been of no positive value but that it has actually been detrimental to and out of harmony with the spirit of our American democracy. I would urge you to oppose the continuation of this committee.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES N. BURROWS,  
Head of Department of Sociology.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY CONFERENCE ON  
PROGRESSIVE SOCIAL LEGISLATION,  
Milwaukee, Wis., February 1, 1939.

Representative SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Milwaukee County Conference at its sessions on October 8, 1938, and at its continuation committee meeting, on January 6, 1939, publicly announced the following position on the Dies committee:

"Be it resolved That we condemn the activities of the Dies committee as being directed against the New Deal, labor unions, and liberal movements, and that we urge that a real investigation be instituted of the espionage activities in the United States; and be it furthermore

"Resolved, That for the above reasons the Dies committee do not receive any more appropriations."

The Milwaukee County Conference on Progressive Social Legislation represents 87 organizations, including A. F. L., C. I. O., and railroad unions, language federations, women's groups, peace groups, church, political, racial, and youth groups, representing in all over 100,000 people.

We hope that you will pay respect to the wishes of these people and rule that the Dies committee cannot receive any appropriations for its activities that have aroused the active support of the Nazis and Silver Shirts in the United States.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS E. CASEY,  
Secretary (Legislative Representative),  
Order Railway Conductors, No. 46.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., January 9, 1939.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
House Office Building:

Vigorously protest continuation of Dies committee or appropriation of funds for its use. When a congressional investigation becomes propaganda for special groups it forfeits confidence of fair-minded people. Suggest Congress investigate to determine if Dies committee subsidized by private organizations, and, if so, how much.

JAMES A. CRAIN.

GROTON, MASS., January 20, 1939.

ADOLPH SABATH,  
House Office Building:

Hope you will report against the Dies resolution as being opposed to principles of the American Civil Liberties Union.

ENDICOTT PEABODY.

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., January 23, 1939.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman, Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

I most vehemently urge you to present an adverse report on a continuation of the Dies committee. Its tactics and practices are most repugnant to me.

WELDON LARRABEE,  
852 North Labrea Avenue, Hollywood, Calif.

PRINCETON, N. J., January 20, 1939.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman, Rules Committee,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Withdraw support of Dies committee. Humiliating exhibition of American politics.

M. C. SHIELDS.

[Press release]

A series of statements condemning the Dies committee as "no more than a publicity racket and a smear campaign, principally against many fine Americans who have progressive or liberal convictions" was issued today by the Council of United States Veterans, Inc., from its eastern district headquarters here at 20 West Forty-third Street.

The statements were made by veterans, among whom two were United States Army generals; one was a recipient of the Congressional Medal of Honor, former lieutenant commander of the United States Navy, former post commander of the American Legion and the Disabled American Veterans; another was a past department chaplain of the American Legion and a past State welfare committee chairman of the Legion; several others were former commanders of American Legion posts. Those who made the statements are all members of either the executive board or the advisory board of the Council of United States Veterans, Inc. This council recently adopted a resolution severely attacking the Dies committee and urging Congress to deny funds for continuation of the Dies committee activities.

In the course of that resolution the council declared that "the membership of the Council of United States Veterans, Inc., consisting of decorated and other prominent veterans of all walks of life, has observed that the membership (as distinct from the leadership) of the major American veterans' organizations, do not approve the tactics of the Dies committee investigation."

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 20, 1939.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
House Office Building:

Hope the House will waste no more money on Representative DIES' partisan and injudicious committee. Attack on Murphy proved him thoroughly unprincipled. Communists and Fascists need investigating by someone more able and sincere.

MILDRED RIORDEN BLAKE.

NEW YORK, N. Y., January 20, 1939.

ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Chairman of the Rules Committee,  
House Office Building:

I wish to protest most vigorously against the continuance of appropriations for the work of the so-called Dies committee. Its activities have been, to my personal knowledge, highly prejudicial to the best interests of American democracy. Have been highly partisan and wholly lacking in constructive value.

ORDWAY TEAD.

DETROIT, February 2, 1939.

HON. A. J. SABATH,  
Chairman, House Rules Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: I note that your committee is now considering the question of extending the life of the Dies committee. While, of course, there is no objection to the work of such a committee if carried on judiciously and impartially, there is serious objection among fair-minded American citizens to the extension of the life of this committee, if it is to continue to be headed by a chairman such as Mr. MARTIN DIES.

I assure you that I speak in the name of many good American citizens in this community when I express the hope that your committee will see fit to deny an appropriation to the Dies committee, unless a fair and impartial chairman is selected for it.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY H. PLATT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., February 3, 1939.

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
House of Representatives:

Philadelphia Industrial Union Council, representing 75,000 organized workers, protest any further appropriation for the un-American Dies committee.

ROBERT WEINSTEIN,  
Secretary, Philadelphia Industrial Union Council.

DETROIT, MICH., January 31, 1939.

Representative ADOLPH J. SABATH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SABATH: The enclosed clipping from a recent issue of the Detroit News tells something of the standing of the Dies committee in Detroit. I would like to raise a citizen's voice against continuing any further investigations under Mr. DIES. The trail he left in Michigan inspires no confidence.

Sincerely yours,

ADELIA DODGE STARRETT.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am emphatically in favor of House Resolution 26 and the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities and Propaganda in the United States. This is in pursuance of House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and the committee was authorized to investigate, first, the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States; second, the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution;

and, third, all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

I am particularly interested in this subject because the district of which I have the honor to represent, namely, the Sixth Congressional District of Michigan, during the last 2 years has been subjected to subversive activities on the part of outside radicals who came to Michigan in great numbers at the time of the labor difficulties, particularly in the city of Flint and the city of Lansing, both of which are in my district.

Let me say, first, that the great mass of industrial workers in Flint and Lansing and throughout my district are law-abiding citizens, believers in the Constitution and believers in the fundamental principles of America. The major difficulty during the strikes occurring in Michigan, and particularly in my district, was due to the propaganda spread by these outside radicals.

I never thought the time would come in my life when the laws of my city and of my State would be ruthlessly set aside, when disorder would prevail, when radicalism would be heard on every hand, and yet that time did come in the strikes of 2 years ago.

Loud-voiced radicals appealed to the masses to assert their authority, to disobey the law, to hold in contempt the courts of our State, and carried their activities so far that the local authorities, particularly in the city of Flint, were unable to cope with the situation and the State authorities did not interfere in this radicalism nor did anything to protect the law-abiding citizens, or to protect life and property.

The testimony of the witnesses from Flint who appeared before the Dies investigating committee, under oath, stated conclusively that the great trouble was the presence and the activities of outside Communists and radicals who were using the local situation as a means of spreading their un-American doctrine. Had it not been that the law-abiding citizens of Flint were in the great majority, believing in the enforcement of the law, believing in the integrity of the courts, then the radicals would have gained greater power than they otherwise did.

We hear a great deal on the floor of Congress in favor of freedom of speech. I know full well the constitutional provision which guarantees to each one freedom of speech. But I wish to call the attention of the House to this thought: That there is a vast difference between the freedom of speech guaranteed by the Constitution, and unbridled license of speech as used by the Communists and radicals who do not believe in American principles.

I think the time has come in America when, instead of shedding useless tears in favor of those who do not believe in American institutions, we should pay some attention to the great mass of honest citizens who do believe in the Constitution and who do believe in the orderly processes of government.

In my judgment, one of the great causes of the spread of subversive doctrines in America has been the loose administration of our immigration laws. I believe in immigration properly regulated, but I do not believe in letting down the bars of immigration so that radicals from foreign countries who believe in every other "ism" but Americanism should be allowed to come to this country and spread their nauseating doctrine of hate.

I have every respect for those from foreign lands who came to the United States with the intent of making this country their home, of becoming attached to American institutions and who learn to love the Constitution of the United States and who are willing to become American citizens and do become law-abiding American citizens. For these people I have the utmost respect, but for those who come from foreign soils, unwilling to become citizens of the United States, unwilling to take the constitutional oath as citizens, but who come here for the sole purpose of undermining the principles of our Government, for these people I have the utmost contempt.

I think the quicker we put teeth in the immigration laws the better for us. I think the quicker we deport aliens ille-



gally here, the better for America. In other words, if aliens come from foreign soil, unwilling to adapt themselves to American principles and to become law-abiding citizens, let them be sent back to the land of their birth. America has no use for such people.

I can honestly state that the Dies investigating committee has done much to alleviate the radical situation in my home city, and the effect of this committee's activities, particularly in my home State, has been greatly beneficial and salutary. I am constantly receiving letters, letters by the hundreds, from patriotic citizens of my district, who stress the thought that the United States should free themselves from those radicals who do not believe in our form of government; that those who are here illegally should be deported; that the immigration laws should be greatly strengthened and then rigidly enforced. If we are to preserve the great heritage of American institutions and love of country, then this must be done, otherwise the great sacrifice made by loyal American soldiers who were willing to give their lives for the preservation of the Constitution and the American form of government was in vain. The great majority of Legionnaires, of Spanish War veterans, and of other soldier organizations are preponderantly in favor of the continued investigation by this committee.

I think this appropriation should be granted and the committee authorized to proceed fearlessly in their investigation, and let the chips fall where they may. There are no politics in this resolution. Every Republican, every Democrat, every man loyal to American institutions should stand back of this committee. I think the committee should be congratulated upon the splendid work that they have done.

I know full well the obstacles that have been placed in the committee's progress from certain sources, but again I state that if we are to preserve America, as you and I have been taught to believe in America, if the America of the future is to protect our boys and girls as we have been protected, then this committee should be authorized to proceed further.

I shall vote for this appropriation gladly, knowing full well that should it carry, as I believe it will, that it will strike a death knell to the ruthless and subversive group whose sole purpose is the destruction of America as you and I know it, and the substitution in its place of a government that will not conform to the great American ideal which has made America the leader of the world.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is a well-known fact that no Member of this Congress is more opposed to communism, fascism, and nazi-ism than I am. Because this is true I am very anxious to support this resolution. I come from a district that is free of all isms. We are Americans and believe in true democracy, and we have worked hard to preserve that democracy. I want this committee to hold the respect of all people who believe in a democratic form of government. Therefore it should be strengthened by adding two or four new members to the committee. Surely nobody who is sincerely anxious to get the best results from this investigation can say that adding new blood to the committee will work a hardship on anyone. We know that during the hearings it became necessary for some of the best members of the committee to be absent. That condition prevails in every committee. A committee should be large enough, I feel, to take care of absences. It should be so constituted that in matters of grave importance such as are before this committee it may at all times have not less than five members present to hear witnesses. Since there has been much criticism of the conduct of the committee, which may or may not be true, it is my conviction that in order to remove such criticism there should be new members on each side of the House added to the committee. We should then get behind the committee and do everything in our power to secure an unbiased investigation of the underlying propaganda spread throughout the country. We cannot do this, however, without investigating the evidence presented before such evidence is made public. I cannot believe any Member of the House

would intentionally smear a witness or encourage a witness to smear another because of some personal or political grudge. Nevertheless it is a fact that this has been done, and many innocent people have been sacrificed on the altar of publicity.

One hundred thousand dollars is a large sum of money to be spent on an investigation unless the investigation is conducted according to the rules of evidence as they would be in any court of justice. If the investigation carries with it the confidence of the American people and gets at the roots of all un-American activities, placing the responsibility where it belongs, then \$100,000 would be a cheap price to pay, but we are entitled to the best that can be had for the taxpayers' money. This committee has a great public service to perform. It can suppress un-American activities by getting at the facts; first examining the evidence and witnesses in executive session, and if found to be reliable and the evidence warrants, submit same to the Department of Justice for further investigation. If this course is not followed, or if any member of the committee uses his power to persecute for personal glorification or political advancement, we shall rue the day we voted this power and money to the committee. The Congress should be careful in the use of labels lest some of the labels be attached to innocent people.

Mr. Speaker, feeling as keenly as I do in this matter and intending to vote for the resolution, I sincerely hope the House will support me in voting down the previous question so that we may have an opportunity to amend the resolution by adding at least two additional members to the committee. This is one of the most serious problems in our national life. It should be disposed of in the American way—honestly, sincerely, and justly. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

#### UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, like most of my colleagues in the Democratic Party, I was too busy in the campaign of last November to pay much attention to the newspaper reports. However, I did hear some repercussions from the Dies committee even during that busy campaign—complaints that the committee was being conducted in such a way as to embarrass Democrats and to assist Republicans. At that time, in fact, it appeared many of the Republicans placed more reliance upon the Dies committee than they did on their own campaign committee.

I had expected possibly the normal change of 25 seats lost by the Democrats—which would have been normal in an off-year election. But when the election was over and 70 seats had been lost I naturally began to inquire the reason for it. Wanting to know the sentiment of my colleagues on this subject, I wrote to each one of the Democratic candidates, both those defeated and those elected, asking them to give me their views of the basic causes for so large a loss on the Democratic side. I was astounded to find the work of the Dies committee as one of the agencies which had contributed largely to this result. I naturally became interested and began investigating, on my own authority, which brought out the fact that most of the membership of the Dies committee itself, with only two exceptions, were also largely busy in their own campaigns for reelection.

I began a careful study of a series of the files of the press covering the entire Dies committee work. These reports pointed out very clearly the character, or lack of it, of the chief investigator for the committee. It developed that before very long the newspapermen themselves made a protest against the retention of Mr. Sullivan as chief investigator, and demanded that the committee in turn investigate its chief investigator. This protest among newspapermen became so strong that after many long weeks of use of Mr. Sullivan the chairman let him out only when the committee funds were exhausted. The character of the committee procedure indicates that Mr. Sullivan was selected and used as the fittest instrument to carry out the purposes of the chairman. I followed this out carefully, investigating thoroughly before I said a word about the entire matter.

I read carefully the report which Mr. Dies submitted to Congress. It is not an honest report. It is not based upon nor supported by the record of the hearings. I therefore went to the hearing records themselves and a careful study of the first volume showed perfectly clearly that there was little, if any, connection between the testimony of the witnesses before that committee and the report which the chairman filed. The reading of this testimony showed clearly that the hearings had been conducted almost entirely by the chairman of that committee, the Honorable MARTIN DIES; that it was a one-man investigation and carried on apparently with one principal objective—that of getting publicity for the chairman. Viewed in that light, it was a huge success. But, viewed in the light of the intention of the Congress in creating that committee, it is the most astounding failure imaginable.

It appeared from the press reports that the chairman of the committee had very early rushed to the radio and broadcast charges that can be classed as nothing less than totally unreliable, so far as facts are concerned. Claims and opinions, with nothing in the hearings to back them up, were rampant, intended to create fear and distrust in the minds of the people and discontent over anything which has been done in their behalf during the past few years. The intent of the Congress in passing the original resolution creating this committee is set out perfectly clearly in the resolution itself which I quote:

*Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of seven Members for the purpose of conducting an investigation of (1) the extent, character, and objects of un-American propaganda activities in the United States, (2) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda that is instigated from foreign countries or of a domestic origin and attacks the principle of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, and (3) all other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.*

It was indeed to ferret out those subversive activities which in themselves might be informative to the House. Here it might be well to remark that the chairman of the committee in conducting his hearings almost entirely overlooked the intent of the House to receive information which was not already in hand. Instead of following that, the chairman very clearly in the hearings began devoting himself largely to those controversial matters which are entirely well known to the Members of the House, and to use his position as chairman of the committee to attack and injure those departments of Government with which his own ideas were not in sympathy. He attacked the National Labor Relations Commission through the most remarkable chain of unreasoning extant in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The chief economist of the N. L. R. B., David Saposs, as a newspaper reporter some years ago reported a Communist meeting. The sapient chairman of the Dies committee grabbed that report as the opinion of the reporter and denounced him as a Communist. He concluded that because the Board had employed this former newspaper reporter as its economist that therefore the Board itself must be communistic. Of course, the whole Congress knows the history sequences which resulted in the writing of that law. The Congress knows the discussions which have gone on over its decisions. The decisions of the courts upholding the Board's rulings. There was no possible information which Mr. Dies could have imparted to the Congress except that in discussing the N. L. R. B. he stepped out of his prescribed duties in pursuit of his antagonism to labor. The National Labor Relations Act simply sets up an agency to protect the lawful rights of labor. Those only who hate labor attack the agencies which serve labor. Anyone who wants to know the labor record of Mr. DIES as a Member of Congress will find much worth-while information on that subject in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 485, in the extension of remarks of Hon. JOSEPH B. SHANNON, Member of Congress from Missouri.

Broadly speaking, the chairman of the committee made attacks principally on organized labor. If that had been the

object of the committee created by the Congress no one would have been surprised at the results, because Mr. DIES' labor record is more spotted than the leopard's skin. From that record there is no difficulty in arriving at the conclusions that his hatred of organized labor, and the rights of labor to organize, especially had from the beginning been his chief antiservice in the House of Representatives. It was not the intention of Congress to delegate to Mr. DIES the authority to attack labor nor the organizations or agencies set up to protect the rights of labor. His accomplishments along this line to the injury of labor, both organized and unorganized, must not therefore be accepted as the attitude of the House of Representatives on that subject. Indeed, the breadth of these attacks, always largely by implication, but sufficiently open to be well understood by anyone who will examine them, is that Mr. DIES attacked the entire New Deal, both in its ideals and its accomplishments. What might have been the source of encouragement along this line I cannot of course say. I think it would perhaps be disclosed if this House were furnished by Chairman DIES with a list of names of persons and organizations who offered him large amounts of money to continue his activities.

If his activities had been deliberately planned to defeat the purpose of the resolution they could not have been more successful.

As to the manner of conducting these hearings, I call your attention to a statement of the first witness before the committee, Mr. John C. Metcalfe. Mr. Metcalfe had been a newspaperman, investigating especially the Nazi German-American Bund in the United States. He had spent some months at this for a well-known Chicago newspaper. He was employed by this committee to continue this investigation. Altogether he spent about a year gathering facts for the use of the committee. The work was well done—done with intelligence and excellent observations. There could hardly have been a better investigator than Metcalfe. His information offered to the committee an opportunity to carry out within a very short time, and at small expense, a thorough-going investigation of the Nazi German-American Bund. He named the leaders; gave their addresses; gave sufficient information to locate exactly each one of the 32 uniformed companies of that organization.

With this information in the hands of the committee, it would have been a very simple matter for the committee to have called in all of the leaders and got from them a first-hand statement of their activities and whatever excuse, if any, they might have had for such an organization on American soil. It would have permitted the subpoenaing of their books and records from which the committee might have learned the names of all the members of this Nazi German-American Bund; what arms they had; what drills they indulged in, where, under whose auspices, and by what authority. It would have enabled the committee to learn and report to the Congress where these uniforms came from; who paid for them; the source of the money; the amount of it, and through their books of accounts the several hundred Nazi conspirators in the United States could have been sufficiently tagged and the light of publicity thrown upon them. Where the law has been broken the heavy hand of justice would have been laid upon them with the proof positive of their participation in whatever crimes had been committed. That altogether would have been very informative to the House, and from all that proof whatever laws, not already on the statute books, required to prevent such activities could easily have been formulated and passed. If the committee had gone at this matter in that way, there would have been nothing but praise for it from any real American.

Chairman DIES failed, neglected, or refused to seize the books, accounts, the records, the uniforms, and other equipment of these shock troops of the bund. Whether this fatally indulgent attitude of the chairman had anything to do with the attendance of Fritz Kuhn, fuhrer of the Nazi German-American Bund; the secretary of the bund, Mr. James Wheeler Hill; Mr. Gustaf Elmer, the national organizer



of the bund; at a banquet in honor of Hon. MARTIN DIES at the Biltmore Hotel in New York on December 8 is a matter to which the chairman may well address himself.

Perfectly evident, the objective of the very intimate information which Mr. Metcalfe's statement gave, certainly should never have been given out publicly nor ever have appeared in the hearings. It gave immediately the opportunity to the bund to cover its tracks and prevent an effective investigation hereafter. The investigator is not for the purpose of testifying before a committee, but to furnish the committee with such information as will enable the committee itself to gather and profit by the information which the investigators are paid to secure. This is of primary importance, as anyone will see. Yet this same folly of public announcement of what the investigators have learned was given such wide publicity as permitted of the covering up of the activities of any of these subversive elements in the United States.

The information in the hands of Chairman DIES in relation to communism in the United States was quite as extensive as that in relation to the Nazi bund. It was not so well studied nor so well presented as was that by Mr. Metcalfe, but it was abundant for securing full information about the Communist activities in America—the source of the money for carrying it on; the actual objects of communism, and the organizers in the employ of the Communists in America, if Mr. DIES had really cared to know the facts and had wanted to communicate them to the Congress as that body had designed he should do when he was appointed chairman of this committee. But, as in the case of the Nazi bund, he broadcasted the news to the world which the investigators brought in and did nothing to secure specific evidence that could be of any use to the Congress.

The committee met and organized and arranged a proper procedure to be carried out in the absence of those members who were of necessity engaged in a political campaign. This provided that the hearings should all be in executive session until the testimony offered was carefully studied, and only that part of it which is applicable to the intention of the resolution should go into the record at all. Every other investigating committee of the House or Senate have always of necessity carried on their investigations through this method, for two perfectly evident reasons: First, to prevent injury to innocent persons whom irresponsible witnesses might through some ulterior motive be tempted to abuse. This is especially applicable to the present investigation because it involves the individual rights of American citizens. Secondly, secrecy was necessary to prevent guilty parties from being forewarned what the committee is really driving at. Both of these have been thrown to the four winds by the chairman of this committee. He proceeded through investigators of his committee to forewarn the very organizations and individuals which ought to have been brought to book, permitting them to cover up any of their erstwhile tracks. Also, it permitted base motives to smear many of the leading citizens of this country, without notice of any charge, without opportunity of answering. This statement is made broadly because while the hearings were being conducted the chairman many times said that anyone who wanted to be heard could be heard. But there were several hundred American citizens who had no possible way of knowing they had been smeared personally or through organizations with which they might have been working for the benefit of the country until the hearings came out. The claim, therefore, that people had an opportunity to be heard individually falls to the ground completely. I here refer anyone who may be interested in this subject to the remarks of the Honorable A. J. SABATH in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 405.

As soon as names and organizations of people began to appear through the volumes of the hearings hundreds of protests were sent to Members of Congress—men and women who did not know they had been smeared by being referred to as Communists or "reds," or some other un-American appellation, and therefore did not have an opportunity to face their accusers and defend their good name and reputation. After such miserable treatment as that, it is quite questionable

whether any American who had once been smeared would be willing to submit himself to a hearing before a committee which had permitted him to be smeared clandestinely. Justice should not permit such miscarriages.

As a matter of convenience, after the proper method of procedure in executive session had been agreed upon by all the members of the committee, Hon. JOHN J. DEMPSEY, a Member of Congress from New Mexico, an able, careful, conservative lawyer, was to look especially after the Southwest, including New Mexico, Arizona, and California. The chief inspector, Eddie Sullivan, was sent out ahead of him to California. After a short time Mr. DEMPSEY met Mr. Sullivan in Los Angeles, and after a very brief conversation was so thoroughly convinced himself that Sullivan had no possible place as an investigator that he dismissed him from his service and wired the chairman to pay absolutely no heed to any report Mr. Sullivan should make. Nevertheless, out of California came one of the most vicious pieces of supposed evidence that is contained in all of the hearings. I refer to the thoroughly infamous Shepherd Knowles, erstwhile secretary of the Associated Farmers, whose vice president, Phillip Bancroft, resigned to run for the United States Senate from California. It was in his special service that Knowles delivered his testimony of some hundreds of pages before the Dies committee. It is necessary to note that the Associated Farmers is not only not a farmers' organization at all but an organization of crooked big business acting under the guise of "Associated Farmers." It is the very antithesis of the New Deal and everything which the New Deal stands for. Later it was learned that the chief conspirator in behalf of this work, Colonel Sanborn, had written all this testimony for Knowles. When certain letters were discovered connecting Knowles up with some of the most infamous acts of espionage and persecution in the history of California, subpoenas were issued for him by another Government agency, but he had already "taken to the woods." He was only contacted after he had gone into the desert, grown whiskers, and put on colored glasses to cover his identity and prevent service by another Government agency.

During a very hard political campaign in California this statement of Knowles was broadcast and used for political purposes against the Democrats and for the Republicans. One of the claims that Knowles set forth was that he represented the Legion of California. This was denied by the Legion officers but no note of this was made in the hearings of the Dies committee. It was and still is held out as being a bona fide statement of a disinterested witness, notwithstanding the fact that a few questions by the chairman would have brought out the desolating facts back of it all. That this propaganda changed many votes in California there is no doubt, because there is one thing that the American people very properly resent, and that is interference in their governmental affairs along every line.

Another piece of political activity on the part of the Dies committee was in relation to the election in the State of Minnesota. Mr. Gehen, one of the Republican campaign managers, came to Mr. DIES at Detroit and secured six subpoenas. He returned to Minnesota, gathered up six stooges, one at least a mental defective, all ardent Republicans, and brought them to Washington and presented their remarkable testimony, which he had written himself for them on the train from Minnesota to Washington. One of these statements was so well done as a piece of political propaganda that it was published as a campaign document and was broadcast against Governor Benton in the campaign as the work of the Dies committee.

In Michigan the committee hearings were so timed and the testimony so composed as to constitute a vicious attack by every implication possible against one of the cleanest and most effective Governors in the United States, Governor Murphy. Again, if the thing had been thoroughly planned by an astute politician of Republican affiliation, it could not have been more effective against Governor Murphy than the hearings before the Dies committee and the associated implications from these hearings.

That the same effect was exercised to a large degree in Indiana and Ohio there can be little doubt.

When I had become well convinced of the character of this supposed investigation I delivered an address over the radio making the charges that I am making here, citing the character of the chief investigator and a number of the thieves and perjurers whose testimony was taken and published in the hearings in the name of a committee of this House. The substance of this address is to be found on page 311 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It has not been denied and cannot be refuted. It constitutes a part of the most infamously conducted hearings in the history of our country.

Of course, I knew enough to know that I, too, would be smeared when I raised objection to continuance of Mr. DIES in control of another committee. True to type, and in accordance to method, immediately Mr. DIES pointed out that some conclusions which I had made in my radio address were similar to conclusions which some young Communist had made. The implication, of course, is perfectly plain; the fact that I had not seen, and had never heard of, the pamphlet, of course, cut no figure. But I am not going to be discouraged from telling the truth of a one-man investigation whose ignorance or worse motivated the hearings until the American people are awake to the fact that the first duty of a congressional committee is to protect innocent individuals against injustices. That the greatest abuse which can befall American institutions is to outrage the Bill of Rights, and to deny men the right of notice of accusation against them and the right to be faced by their accusers before they shall be subjected to the ignominy of having their names smeared in a Government publication.

I am herewith submitting three telegrams which passed between the Honorable ARTHUR HEALEY and the Honorable JOHN J. DEMPSEY, members of the committee, jointly to Mr. DIES; the answer of Mr. DIES to Mr. DEMPSEY and Mr. DEMPSEY's reply to Mr. DIES:

LAS CRUCES, N. MEX., October 26, 1938.

HON. MARTIN DIES,  
Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned have communicated with each other by telephone this afternoon. As members of the committee to investigate un-American activities, we request that you defer further meetings of the committee until we can be present after the election and until after the full committee has had an opportunity to meet and consider procedure for a preliminary examination of the testimony to be offered to the committee. We are greatly disturbed by the charges such as those made yesterday by the President himself that procedure has been adopted which has permitted the committee to be improperly used for election purposes, and we particularly deplore the kind of attack that has been permitted upon an outstanding Government servant like Governor Murphy, of Michigan. In a few States, like your State of Texas, there is only one election struggle—in the primary—and only part of the members are free to be in Washington, like you, during the fall campaign. But others of us, in fairness to our constituency and to all nominees of our party, must be in our district during this time. It is obviously unfair to us as members of the committee under these circumstances, particularly after it is under fire, that it should attempt to continue its hearings when we are unable to be present to participate in the determination of proper procedure and take responsibility for its proceedings.

ARTHUR D. HEALEY.  
JOHN J. DEMPSEY.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 27, 1938.

HON. JOHN J. DEMPSEY,  
Lordsburg, N. Mex.:

Acknowledging receipt of your telegram protesting against continuance of hearings until after election, beg to advise that a majority of committee has authorized me to continue the hearings regardless of the approaching election. I know that you are aware of the fact that the expenses and salaries of our investigators and clerks are rapidly exhausting our balance and that it is therefore necessary for us to hear the witnesses as rapidly as possible. But there is a stronger reason than this for the continuance of the hearings. Our committee is an agency of an independent branch of the Government, and any successful attempt to stifle the hearings for political purposes would be most unfortunate. Before I had any idea of what the testimony would develop I announced that hearings would be started and prosecuted as rapidly as possible. The great majority of witnesses who have appeared before the committee were subpoenaed by our investigators, and all of our

investigators were recommended by outstanding Democrats. I am and have always been a loyal Democrat, but there are questions much bigger than mere partisanship, and certainly I believe that the question of preserving the fundamental principles of Americanism transcends in importance political expediency. But even from a party standpoint I am convinced that it is better for Democrats to take the initiative and fearlessly expose subversive activities that threaten the very existence of the Republic even if in doing so a few candidates for office on the Democratic ticket are involved. The committee has been eminently fair since the beginning of its hearings. In fact, I know of no other investigating committee which repeatedly offered the opportunity to any person or organization involved in any charge or attack to appear before the committee and disprove the charge or attack. To my way of thinking, it would be a cowardly thing to postpone hearings until after the election, for to do so would imply that the Democratic Party is unwilling for the people to have the facts when they go to the polls, which I do not think is true so far as the majority of Democrats are concerned; while I have the highest regard for you and would like very much to comply with your request, I cannot do so for the reasons above given.

MARTIN DIES,  
Member of Congress.

LORDSBURG, N. MEX., October 28, 1938.

HON. MARTIN DIES, Chairman,  
Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities,  
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Retel 27th in answer to the joint telegram signed by the Honorable A. D. HEALEY and myself. When I was last present at an executive session of the committee in Washington the majority of the committee decided that, as a matter of procedure and in order to protect citizens who were being attacked by irresponsible people, making harsh and detrimental statements which could not be substantiated, the committee would conduct hearings in executive session, giving to the public and the press such information as was proved true and coming within the scope of our jurisdiction. You at that time called attention of certain members of the committee to the fact that partisan politics was being injected into the investigation, something that several members of the committee resented. Much valuable evidence has been obtained and great good could result if the committee will proceed along proper lines. You say it would be cowardly to postpone further hearings until the entire committee can be present and all the members can voice their feeling with reference to procedure. I know of nothing more cowardly than to permit wild and irrational statements which have no basis in fact and have only for their end the assassination of characters of men who are outstanding and who both you and I know to be American citizens of the highest type. If this method is to be followed, it can only result in undoing what good the committee has accomplished and finally must result in total repudiation of these investigations. If we are to expect such a continuation I have no other alternative than to ask the Speaker of the House to accept my resignation as a member of the committee and to insist that my name be used no further in connection with the committee's activities.

JOHN J. DEMPSEY.

A careful reading of these telegrams will give proof to every essential fact upon which I am basing this statement, that Mr. DIES made it strictly a one-man committee. Read these telegrams carefully. They tell much of the story, are official, and are certainly unbiased. They are the joint accusations of two high-class lawyers, men of ability and experience. These telegrams were all given to the press at the time, but they need to be repeated here.

Of course, I am aware that the continuation of the Dies committee is going to be voted by this House by an overwhelming majority, one of the principal reasons for which is that the entire Republican side pledged themselves in advance to support the resolution to continue this committee. This is not to be wondered at, because the Republican Party did largely profit by the activities of this committee under the direction of Mr. DIES, and it is natural that such methods, if again employed, may continue to their advantage in the hereafter. Or this \$100,000 which in their estimation may be a Republican campaign fund may burn their fingers.

Many Democrats honestly fearing that they themselves might be suspected of undue influence from subversive American activities will join with them. Many others will say, "What's the use; it is going over, anyway; so let it go." That is the source of the backing which this resolution will receive in the final vote on this subject.

Of the 435 Members of the House, not 20 had studied or even read the first 3 volumes of hearings. And nobody had read the fourth volume because it was not yet off the press. The Rules Committee was willing to, and did, report out a resolution for continuing the Dies committee under



such conditions. I asked again and again, "Why hurry? Why the rush? Why not wait until the hearings are all printed and time given for the Members of the House to study those hearings and know what has been done before we were asked for a continuance of this committee?"

When I saw what was likely to be the decision, I put the question frankly to that committee of which Mr. DIES is a member, whether the protagonists of the resolution were afraid to let the House know the facts before voting. There was, of course, no answer to those questions. But the majority of the Rules Committee brought the question onto the floor of the House under a rule which prevented any Member of the House from offering an amendment to the resolution. I, along with others, should have voted for the resolution if it had provided for nine members instead of the same seven which the original resolution had provided. This would have clearly taken away from Mr. DIES the ability to dominate the committee and make it again a one-man investigation, with the spotlight again playing on the countenance of the chairman. But such an amendment was not permitted to be offered.

What we do not need in the United States is the suspicion, fear, resentment, distrust, dissention, jealousy, prejudice, and disorganization of American public opinion which the Dies procedure has stirred up.

What we do need most is the broadest possible tolerance along all lines. Tolerance of religion; tolerance of race; tolerance of national origin; tolerance of ideals; tolerance of opinions; and, most of all, at the present time we need an all-embracing tolerance of economic proposals. Because here we stand in the presence of six or seven millions of unwillingly idle men and women—idle through no fault of their own, idle because our great democracy has not solved the problem of unemployment. Only through the greatest consideration for one another—the broadest tolerance for the expression of ideas—can we hope to receive and consider the best ideas looking to the solution of this greatest of all problems—that of assuring through government an opportunity for a job for every man and woman who wants to work.

That is a task beyond the individual. It is the problem of the great democratic mass. It must be solved. It will be solved because our American spirit that has taken us out of every difficulty in the last 150 years must be trusted to take us out of the present difficulty.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this House proposes in a few minutes to adopt by an overwhelming vote the resolution before it and to serve notice upon all Communists, Nazis, and Fascists that the Members of the House will not compromise in any way with the spread of communism, nazi-ism, or fascism in the United States. [Applause.]

I am hopeful that when this investigation is again under way it will get more cooperation from the executive departments of the Government than it has received in the past. I desire to quote some words of Alexander Pope in reference to the attitude of the administration, which has hampered and harassed the Dies investigating committee from the very beginning, in spite of the fact it had a mandate from the House of Representatives that it should aid that investigation and supply investigators, lawyers, and clerical help. The attitude of the New Deal administration is best expressed in these words:

Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer,  
And without sneering teach the rest to sneer;  
Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike,  
Just hint a fault, and hesitate dislike.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I refuse to yield.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and his committee need not be surprised at the virulent attacks and the attempts of the Communists and their friends of the United Front to smear the committee, as that is the usual tactics of the Communist Party and its allies and subsidiaries.

The Communists and other radicals are again up to their old tricks of trying to smear every investigation by Congress into un-American and seditious activities in the United States. Every known device of ridicule, distortion, and falsehood is being unloosed by skillful radical propagandists to undermine and destroy public confidence in the Dies committee. The congressional committee deserves the support of all American citizens, irrespective of party affiliations.

The deplorable fact is that not a single alien Communist has been deported to Soviet Russia since Miss Perkins took office, and I doubt if any will be as long as she holds office.

I hope the Dies committee will continue its investigation of the political link between the Workers' Alliance, a Communist controlled group, and the W. P. A., particularly in New York City. I hold in my hand a telegram from the Workers' Alliance that probably was sent to other Members of the House. It reads:

On behalf of Workers' Alliance of America representing four hundred thousand unemployed and W. P. A. workers, we urge Rules Committee do not extend life or vote funds to Dies committee.

And so forth. This telegram is signed by David Lasser, national president, and Herbert Benjamin, general secretary-treasurer, two of the most notorious Communists in the United States of America. These men claim to be speaking for 400,000 unemployed and W. P. A. workers. I say to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] that if we appropriate \$100,000 for the Dies committee and that \$100,000 is spent alone on exposing the Workers' Alliance and showing the wage earners of America that it is a 100-percent Communist-controlled organization, the money will be well spent. [Applause.]

We are talking about appropriating \$2,000,000,000 for national defense. I say we have more to fear from our enemies within than from our enemies from without. [Applause.] Yet there are those who question the advisability of spending \$100,000 to preserve our own American system—our free institutions and representative and constitutional form of government. [Applause.]

I love the Dies committee for the enemies it has made. I do not want this Congress to wait to take legislative action, however, until the Dies committee reports its findings a year from now. I hope the Congress will take action at this session and enact laws to deport all alien Communist, Nazi, and Fascist agitators and send them back to their native lands, and give their jobs to loyal American citizens now walking the streets looking for employment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, Mr. Speaker; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend for 1 hour the time for debate on this most important question.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, being a lawyer I, of course, cannot say anything in 1 minute, but I want to tell you this, that we have communism in this country and we have plenty of it, and we are going to have more of it if we do not find jobs and food and clothing for the needy people of this country. [Applause.] Let me say also that the House and the Senate did not help the situation any the other day by cutting down the amount Colonel Harrington and the President of the United States wanted in order to take care of the people until next June.

A few days ago I told the House my position against communism and all other isms, excepting Americanism. I need not restate my stand, but let us take stock of the immediate

situation. With millions of men, women, and children living from one day to another by relief money and with our aged people receiving scarcely enough to keep body and soul together, we must not work ourselves into a frenzy if we find Communists and communism in our midst.

We must solve this economic question which challenges the best statesmanship of the country. Ex-President Hoover tried for 3 years to solve the question and President Roosevelt is continuing efforts to find the answer, but hungry and needy families are still with us in the number of millions. We must not permit this country to become a breeding ground or hotbed for communism. In desperation, when men and women are hungry, they will listen intently to any type of propaganda which, they are falsely told, will offer relief. Continued hunger and need cause people to go afield and sometimes to commit crimes.

Other committees have been appointed by this House in the past to investigate un-American activities with no results excepting they found out what we already knew. Let us quit looking across the ocean for trouble and turn our eyes closer to home and find a way to remove the causes of communism by giving men and women work at living wages. We attempted to meet the situation by pump priming; but remember the time will come when we will run out of priming water. I will not vote for an appropriation of money to investigate something already known, but if I could have secured my amendment anent the causes of communism, then we would have a horse of another color. With an enlightenment on the causes, Congress would have been in a better position to pass remedial legislation to meet the needs of our people which will wipe out communism. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUNN].

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, if \$100,000 was being requested for the purpose of ascertaining the reasons for the unemployment situation, a great deal more good for humanity's sake would be accomplished than to spend that amount of money for the investigation of un-American activities.

If the advocates of communism, socialism, fascism, nazi-ism, or any other kind of "ism"—and God knows there is a multiplicity of them—tried to overthrow or undermine our Government, they would not be successful in their undertaking if we representatives of the people will secure jobs at a living wage for the millions who are unemployed.

Regardless of how much money we would spend for the investigation of un-American activities, we would not accomplish anything worth while as long as one-third of our people are in need of food, shelter, and clothing. Unnecessary human suffering. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I would gladly vote a million dollars, if necessary, to the Dies committee for a thoroughgoing investigation of un-Americanism in this country. Any such investigation would, of necessity, include a study of the wicked, disloyal, un-American ways of lobbyists attempting to influence the action of the Congress in the interest of the special privilege of powerful business groups.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, lobbying is not necessarily harmful in itself. It is that lobbying that resorts to corrupt or subversive and unconstitutional means of influencing legislation to which I strenuously object.

In my opinion, the most powerful lobby of all, the most dangerous and subversive of all, is that maintained by the grain and cotton futures traders—gamblers on price changes in our commodity markets. I understand that the lobbyists of the Chicago Board of Trade alone occupy an entire floor at the Mayflower Hotel. Other futures markets, such as the New York Cotton Exchange, maintain large numbers of lobbyists here at Washington. Their activities are most subversive of good government, and are pernicious in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, let us get down to cases. There are many Members of the House who believe that there should be some provision of law on the subject of margin requirements in futures markets. There is, as we know, such provision of law as to stock markets, but not as to futures markets. Many of us think that the Commodity Exchange Act should be amended so as to authorize the Commodity Exchange Commission to regulate margin requirements in futures markets.

Yet there is a general feeling here, Mr. Speaker, that the speculators are not going to let the Congress pass any such amendment. If there is any basis in fact for that feeling which prevails among my colleagues, that is a terrible indictment against the lawmaking branch of the Government of the United States, and against those who have caused such a situation to exist. Lobbying of that sort is a treasonable obstruction of and interference with the fundamental functions of our Government.

There are many Members of this House, Mr. Speaker, who are convinced that the self-interest of these commodity gamblers is the one thing, above all, that has interfered with, and still interferes with, the enactment of effective farm legislation. These commodity gamblers propose, by their dog-in-the-manger attitude, to force farmers into general insolvency by means of low prices, deliberately held by these gamblers "in line with world prices," and to force the entire Nation to suffer distress because of lack of adequate purchasing power on the farms in order that these market racketeers may fatten and flourish on the financial failure of the farmers.

Recently the New Orleans Cotton Exchange published its annual report. President Roosevelt was then at Warm Springs. He gave an interview to the press. In effect he said: "These exchanges deplore the sad plight of agriculture, but not one of them comes forward and offers any constructive program of farm legislation." I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the reason why these grain and cotton futures traders do not suggest any constructive farm legislation is that any such program would automatically abolish their racket. These market parasites thrive on low prices to farmers. They thrive on prices that are unstable and in continual state of fluctuation.

And the Chamber of Commerce of the United States aids this racket. The other day it held a conference of hand-picked businessmen and farmers, and then it gave out a statement to the press that it favored direct governmental subsidies to farmers to make up the deficiency arising from low prices of farm products in the market place. The income of the farmers at present, on the basis of world prices, is not more than seven and a half billion dollars a year. It should be, on a reasonably honest basis, not less than \$12,000,000,000 a year. So the Chamber of Commerce of the United States would have the Government pay to the farmers each year the sum of four and a half billion dollars in cold cash out of the Treasury of the United States—unless they mean merely "token payments"—in order that prices may continue to be and to remain on the low, unstable basis of futures market ticker-tape quotations.

Certain of my colleagues have hesitated over the question whether or not they should introduce a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to authorize the Commission to regulate margin requirements in futures markets. They seem to fear, because of the strong opposition of the lobbyists, that it would be useless to introduce such a bill. It may be that the futures gamblers will be able to kill House Resolution 25, which I introduced early in this session for a House committee investigation of futures trading.

There should be at least a hearing before a congressional committee on futures trading and its effect on agricultural prices. Light is needed on this subject to enable the Congress to enact effective farm legislation. But these board-of-trade lobbyists are now busy on Capitol Hill discouraging the holding of any such hearing. Arguments are being made privately why such a hearing should not be held, why there is no need for new legislation. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker,



that those arguments should be presented at an open hearing, not in whispered confidences. It is an un-American, unconstitutional denial of the rights of our citizens to prevent, or to seek to prevent, the holding of proper congressional hearings. If the Dies committee will investigate the un-American activities of these board of trade lobbyists, I am sure it will render a very important service to the Government and to the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the investigation by the Dies committee included pernicious activities inimical to our Government, by both American citizens and aliens.

Insofar as subversive activities by aliens is concerned, I see no reason why we should not now protect ourselves from this possibility. Other nations have for years had in operation means for protecting themselves against alien subversive activity. We have long been too lenient in this matter. Certainly Congress need wait on no investigation before proceeding with the legislation required to guarantee this protection.

That the committee found communism promulgated by American citizens, both in high and low places, need surprise no one. This Congress should scarcely need a \$100,000 investigation to apprise them of this fact. Certainly there is no need to leave Washington to observe the present trend toward totalitarian government. The expansion of bureaucracy in our Federal Government and the increasing regimentation of our citizens is well known to the Members of this body. Bureaucracy, fascism, nazi-ism, communism, are one and the same with slight variations. The Dies committee concludes the same.

Therefore, if we would stem the tide of communism in these United States, this Congress must attack it not only from without but also from within. An unbalanced Budget, a mounting Federal debt, financial uncertainty, and over-taxation lead to unemployment and consequent misery to the mass of the people. This is the fertile soil for communism.

This Congress must take back to itself the lawmaking powers which are now so largely in the control of the all-powerful bureaus here in Washington. We must bring about substantial deflation of this Federal bureaucracy. It is our further problem to balance the national Budget and straighten out our tangled finances and money muddle.

Whatever else may be necessary to save our Nation from complete communism, these things must be done—they are fundamental. Once they are done, the basic foundation for real recovery will be laid.

If bureaucratic or communistic control should be made complete in this country, it will not be altogether because of organized communistic efforts from the outside, but it will also be because Congress has failed in preserving the American system of free enterprise, vouchsafed us by the founding fathers.

The chief value of the work of the Dies committee has been to clarify the issue and to acquaint and arouse the public to the widespread activity of communism in this country. It is my hope that in appropriating this money that the committee will demonstrate to this Congress the need of early action by this body to check the forces within the Government itself which are undermining our American system.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL].

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to urge passage of this resolution because un-American activity is a major issue, not only in my State but in the very district which I represent.

For the past several years un-American forces in this country have boasted that Minnesota was to be the proving ground for their alien philosophies and that other States would follow.

Having in mind the riots, the loss of lives, the destruction of property brought about by their efforts to establish this

proving ground, I am convinced that the menace of un-American activity is the greatest danger to American democracy today.

At this very minute several hundred employees of an industrial plant in my State are idle because that plant has been illegally possessed by sit-downers for the last 4 weeks. Who here would deny that the sit-down strike is un-American?

The rank and file of most labor unions, not only in my State but all over the country could settle their grievances with employers in an hour. Members of those unions are honest, hard-working, home-owning Americans of the highest type.

In scores of cases the American laboring man has seen his union taken over and controlled by alien agitators and foreign trouble makers boring from within in an effort to cause riot and disregard for law and order.

A few days ago I listened to debate on this floor on the question of politics in W. P. A. The W. P. A. Writers' Project in Minneapolis is filled to the brim with alien propagandists, proud of their teaching that democracy must be overthrown, that dictatorship of the masses must prevail, and that God is a heretic.

Those are the kind of people that the Federal Government is paying to write the history of my State and my country.

Time will not permit my reading them, but I hold in my hand signed statements showing the names and affiliations of a score of nationally known Communist leaders who continue to spread their un-American teachings while working for the American Government in Minnesota.

I say to the Members of this House, unless we stop such un-American activity and do it soon I will not long have the freedom to stand here and make such a speech and you will not long have the right to even listen to such a speech.

No further away than last Sunday a Minneapolis newspaper, under an extra-column headline, "State F.-L. Ousts 13 City Delegates in Party Purge," had this to say. I quote:

The Farmer-Labor Party moved to clean house in the party last night, driving 14 alleged Communists from their convention and forbidding the Workers' Alliance and other groups from being part of the Farmer-Labor Association.

A wild 2-day convention came to an end in an atmosphere of bitterness that had Hennepin County the constant butt of attack by Farmer-Laborites from the rest of the State, and had Ramsey County uniting with the rest of the State in an insistent and successful demand for a purge and a new start in party affairs.

Some of my colleagues can testify that party purges are not always successful.

Minnesota for 2 years up to last November 8 had been under the administration of a Communist-infested third party. Last November 8 the people of Minnesota drove them from office because they wanted neither Communists nor Communist cat's-paw in power.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that to spend a billion and a half for defense against imaginary invaders who might some day come from Europe, and refuse to spend \$100,000 to ferret out and drag into the daylight those enemies already here and tearing at the very heart of our democracy is sheer stupidity.

Defense against those enemies within our ranks is just as important as defense against enemies thousands of miles away.

Why look at the tree and miss the forest? Why spend a billion and a half building defense against imaginary invaders when we are already being invaded?

No great country has ever fallen because of attack from outside. Great nations fall from attack from within. That attack is already under way in this country.

If democracy is to fail, it will not be because some totalitarian regime from across the seas has landed an army on our shores. It will be when we have permitted these alien plotters to carry their campaign to its ultimate end.

If, as some of my colleagues claim, there is no cause for apprehension in this country, then why do they fear such an investigation? If we have no alien threat to this country, let us find it out. That would be a result to be welcomed, not feared.

If, on the other hand, a continuation of this investigation will bring to light the enemies of true democracy within our ranks, then let us keep chopping and let the chips fall where they may. The American people demand the facts. They demand that Congress control said investigation, in order that it may be free from political interference.

That, Mr. Speaker, is why I urge the passage of this resolution, and if this committee can expose these alien enemies, I will willingly vote for another hundred thousand, or a million, if necessary, to send them back to the dictators they love. America has no place for them. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I fully realize that Attorney General Frank Murphy does not belong to the Black Legion. I presume this is why the Dies committee did not investigate that un-American activity in my State.

The conscientious Members of this body and the people of the United States interested in the perpetuation of our democratic institutions are interested in legislation to curb un-American activities and are not interested in a long, drawn-out investigation creating Nation-wide unrest and demoralization. I believe I can speak for the average American citizen, and I believe that this investigation should report back to the Congress in this session so that we may enact legislation to actually curb un-American activities and not prepare some political philosophy for the 1940 political campaign. [Applause.]

No one realizes more than I the seriousness of the problems which face our American democracy today. The world is full—has been full for the past decade—of a number of ideologies that seek to supplant our democratic processes with systems which deny to the individual those liberties which traditionally are a part of American life. I know that there has been among a certain misguided section of our population an acceptance of these foreign philosophies. It is important that we should learn to what extent the efforts to propagandize our citizens has proceeded. Secret organizations with subversive aims should be brought to light. We in America who insist that the democratic way of life is not outmoded, who believe that democratic government can be made to function in a complex industrial civilization, must realize that we cannot remain inactive in the face of organized and overt efforts to overthrow that Government.

But I want also to remind you that we cannot afford, the Congress of the United States cannot afford, to authorize any investigation of un-American activities that does not confine itself to that subject. The Congress of the United States should authorize an investigation of the causes and extent of subversive activity in our Nation. We have not had such an investigation to date. We need an investigation that will ferret out facts, not rumor; one that will present to this body recommendations on which intelligent and reasoned legislation can be based.

Last fall the committee authorized by resolution of the last Congress came to the State of Michigan in the course of its investigation. On the basis of incomplete and inconclusive evidence, this committee permitted its findings to be used in one of the most brazen and un-American political campaigns which I have ever witnessed. I refer to the attempt to smear the character of Governor Murphy, now Attorney General of the United States. We now know the facts as to Governor Murphy's handling of the delicate labor situation which arose in the Michigan automobile industry. Every sane American applauds Governor Murphy for what he did—all perhaps except the committee which ostensibly was appointed to investigate un-American activities.

Let me remind you also that at the very time that the committee was in Michigan making political capital for the Republicans out of a prejudiced hearing of prejudiced witnesses, there was in Michigan a situation that well deserved attention. Almost 2 years ago I brought to the attention of this House certain facts concerning the Black Legion of Michigan. I said at that time—and it was a matter of public knowledge—that the Black Legion has as one of its aims the

overthrow of democracy in the United States. Its methods were those of terrorism and brutality, even murder. Subsequent events have shown the true colors of the Black Legion. A half dozen members of that group have been brought to book and are now serving terms in State prisons of Michigan.

Who supported the Black Legion? What role did it play in the political life of Michigan? What connection did it have with the Wolverine Republican Club, of Detroit? How far has its activities been connected with the prevention of legitimate labor-union activity? What connection did the Black Legion have with corporate wealth? All these are questions as yet but partially answered.

Only a matter of a few weeks ago the reputed major general of the Black Legion, who had fled to Ohio—a Mr. Effinger—was returned on extradition proceedings to Michigan where he is to stand trial under the Syndicalist Act of my State. Perhaps the courts of the State of Michigan will be able to arrive at the true facts regarding the Black Legion. But last fall, when the House committee was in Michigan, was there any investigation of the Black Legion? There was not. There was no attempt to determine the extent to which the legion still survives or to study the sources of its support. No; the committee came to Michigan on a political snipe-hunting expedition; and, gentlemen, the people of this Nation are still holding the bag.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the American people want action, not insults. Surely, with the radio, the press, and the movies, there is sufficient opportunity to provide the public with humor and entertainment. We do not need to create a special committee of this House to add to those facilities.

Gentlemen, with the indulgence of this House, I shall read a resolution adopted and approved by the Convention of the Upper Peninsula Association of Legion Posts of Michigan, of which I have been a member since the World War:

*Be it resolved by the convention of the Upper Peninsula Association of Legion Posts, That we commend the Congress of the United States for its desire to investigate the extent of the activities of communism, fascism, and nazi-ism within the borders of the United States; be it further*

*Resolved, That we urge the appropriation of funds to conduct such an investigation; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the practice of the Dies committee in permitting the according and publicizing as facts matters which were only heresy and caused unjust reflections on good Americans is hereby condemned; and be it further*

*Resolved, That this convention commend all public officials of our Government, both of State and Federal, who have condemned subversive influences and who have recommended legal action to defend our form of government against such influences.*

I note that House Resolution No. 26, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies], provides that the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Propaganda and Activities is authorized to continue with the power and authority conferred upon it by the action of the last Congress, and further that this committee would be authorized to continue until January 3, 1941, before reporting the findings to this body or recommending legislation concerning the purpose of its creation.

My reference to the political activities of the committee in the last campaign in Michigan necessarily provokes this question: Was that political sabotage so successful in the mind of the gentleman from Texas that he wanted the power to continue through the 1940 Presidential campaign for the purpose of defeating the liberal movement so necessary to the existence of this democracy?

The conscientious Members of this body and the people of the United States of America interested in the perpetuation of our democratic institutions are interested in legislation to curb un-American activities and not in a long-drawn-out investigation that creates Nation-wide unrest and bewilderment. I believe I speak for the average American citizen when I say give us action and legislation, not dreamy investigations.

Therefore it is my opinion that this committee, if continued, should be increased by the presence of the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of War, and that the committee should report to this Congress not later than June 15 of this year with recom-



recommendations for legislation that would definitely curb un-American activities in this Nation.

If we are to believe all the things reported by the committee on January 3, 1939, and if the committee was interested in legislation instead of in its own personal aggrandizement, we should have at this time submitted to this Congress legislation based upon that report. The committee does not see fit to recommend legislation, but requests further authority to carry on for the glorification of the committee. May I present this question for your consideration: Is this Congress going to definitely act to curb un-American activities by legislation, or is it going to allow this investigation to carry on to such a point that any political philosophy that does not meet with the personal approval of the committee will be assassinated as un-American?

I am so thoroughly convinced that we are in present need of drastic legislation to curb un-American activities from the reports of committees already made to this Congress that unless this committee is limited in its report and recommendations for legislation are made before the adjournment of this Congress, I shall be forced to cast my vote against the resolution. If this resolution is properly framed so that we will be definitely assured of legislation based on the principle for which this committee was created, I shall be more than pleased to vote in favor of such a resolution.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this committee called the Dies committee are laudable and proper. My hatred of Communists is as great as my hatred of Fascists and Nazis. It is hoped that all influence making for converts to those "isms" can be ripped out root and branch. But some of the methods pursued by this committee heretofore make for increased rather than lessened communism, nazi-ism, and fascism.

I shall vote down the previous question so that we may have an opportunity to offer amendments to the resolution.

The personnel of the committee should be increased. Some of its personnel have been most intolerant and have been guilty of practices that have a tendency to create the very radicalism they seek to destroy. I would want the Speaker to appoint as additional members of that committee, men of poise and understanding, of judicial temperament, of fairness in thought and speech.

I shall vote for the final resolution primarily because recently, in a conversation I had with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], he agreed specifically that he had made errors and that he would not repeat them. I asked him a series of questions in order to bring out his future plans for the conduct of his committee. His answers were satisfactory.

Firstly, I asked him: "Are you going to make the same fiery and unbalanced speeches over the radio that you have made heretofore?" His answer was "No." I explained that as chairman of the committee he was more like a judge; that it was improper for him to prejudice his witnesses by making intolerant speeches against them. He agreed.

Secondly, I asked him, "Are you going to hire a skillful and adroit lawyer to sift fact from fiction, wheat from chaff, and are you going to follow his advice and counsel?" He said "Yes." Heretofore he and his committee members have refrained from hiring counsel. They probably did not have money to do so. But many a worthy member of the bar would have been glad to donate his services. A committee of this important character cannot successfully function without the aid of good counsel. Again the gentleman from Texas agreed.

Thirdly, I asked him, "Will you continue to allow your committee to be a sounding board for crackpots and professional agitators?" He said he would not.

Lastly, I asked him, "In your reports, are you going to come to strained and violent conclusions based on flimsy and insufficient evidence?" He said he would exercise the greatest care and vigilance before making any pronouncements, and that he would be as cautious as possible.

It must be remembered that the leadership of the House has put its imprimatur of approval on this resolution. It apparently is going to carry overwhelmingly. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has been cautioned against intemperate remarks against the administration, and I understand further that he has agreed not to attack the administration.

In the light of these questions and answers and the pledges of Mr. DIES, I am constrained to vote for the resolution, after voting against taking the previous question.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, at the time this special committee submitted its report to the House, I issued a statement which I believe is an appropriate and constructive criticism of the procedure followed at times by the Dies committee. It follows:

I have signed the report because I believe that this committee, with the limited resources at its disposal, has shed some light on the scope and extent of the activities of subversive forces and have, in my opinion, definitely established that un-American forces are most actively at work in our midst in an effort to destroy our form of government, and because it is my earnest desire that Congress shall appropriate an adequate sum of money to guarantee a thorough and complete investigation of the machinations and activities of these un-American forces within our borders.

However, I do not mean to be understood as approving the methods employed on some occasions by this committee during the investigation. The objectives of this investigation are of such paramount importance to the welfare of our Nation that every care should be exercised lest its findings be confused, undermined, or impeached because of procedure which may in some cases be charged as deviating from traditional American principles of fairness and impartiality.

While it is true that an investigating committee cannot be circumscribed by strict adherence to ordinary rules of evidence in accepting testimony, nevertheless, because of the temptation of some overzealous witnesses to take advantage of the committee by offering testimony either of an exaggerated nature or unsubstantiated and uncorroborated by evidence of fact, I believe that such an investigation should be guided by orderly and judicial principles except where matters of compelling public interest require a departure. I believe that the groundwork should be laid for the reception of testimony by first determining its relevance and foundation in factual evidence.

Because the work of this committee is of such vital importance to the Nation, its investigation should not be permitted to be undermined and weakened in the public mind by permitting use of the investigation for the airing of mere personal grievances or unfounded charges. Neither should its patriotic services be permitted to suffer from any tinge of partisan or political considerations nor the forum of the investigation be used as a political sounding board by persons seeking political advantage.

Believing that Americanism can best be promoted by adhering to the fullest extent possible to the spirit of our Constitution and its safeguards, I early made the request that, before the reception of the testimony of any witness, the committee first conduct executive hearings to determine the factual value of the testimony and distinguish between testimony which would shed light on the objectives of the committee and testimony in the nature of meaningless generalities, mere expressions of opinion without at least some foundation in fact and testimony animated merely by personal grievances. Moreover, where charges of a serious nature are made before the committee against individuals or organizations, traditional American fairness requires that every opportunity be extended to those charged to reply and defend their reputations.

If the Congress decides to continue the life of this committee or authorize any other committee to conduct this inquiry—and I feel most strongly that this work should be continued—I believe that sums adequate to supply the most competent type of counsel and qualified investigators should be appropriated.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution to continue the inquiry by this committee. And if it is so adopted, I hope that the House will make it plain that it desires the committee to eliminate the unnecessary showmanship, sensationalism, and "appeal to the grandstand" that has done so much to impair the effectiveness of the committee's work and to buckle down to a serious and judicial factual investigation which may provide a sound basis for future action by Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] has been unjustly accused of plagiarizing, stealing the words and thoughts of a well-known Communist writer and using those words and thoughts as his

own in a radio address, and afterward recording them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Saturday, January 28. That is a very serious charge to make against a Member of Congress, a very serious charge indeed. For my part I question the validity of the charge. I give the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] the benefit of the doubt. I consider him entirely innocent of the charge placed against him.

From what I know of the gentleman from Illinois, I do not believe he did plagiarize, that he did steal the words and thoughts that he used. I believe they were his own words and thoughts, that they expressed his own sentiments, that he believes what he said in that radio address, and that he should receive full credit for the same, full credit.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. No; I will not.

Now, there can be no denial that the words and thoughts expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] in his radio address and afterward recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are of the same pattern, are, in fact, nearly identical with the words and thoughts of the Communist writer, Mr. Adam Lapin. They are so nearly similar in pattern, in style, in content, to the words and thoughts of the Communist writer, that it was only natural that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] should be suspected of plagiarizing. However, it is my well-considered thought that the similarity between the words and thoughts of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] and the words and thoughts of the Communist writer, Mr. Lapin, only proves that the minds, the thoughts, the ideas, the sympathies, and the aims of these two men are so much alike that they naturally use the same words and phrases to express themselves. That fact is the significant fact in the whole controversy, as I see it. It is the all-important fact, the fact that should be kept in mind in the future by the Members of this Congress and by the people back home. [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, the name of one member of this committee has become a household word. Lest the matter become too serious in debate, I suggest this committee be continued until—as I read recently—every Communist in the country is made familiar with that old maxim, "Never say Dies." [Laughter.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes. I favor the passage of this resolution to continue the Dies committee. The longer the hearings on the resolution continued before the Committee on Rules the more I was impressed with the work of the Dies committee. Every conceivable obstacle was placed in the way of the committee. It had to carry on single-handedly with limited funds. The executive departments of the Government refused to give it any assistance and in some instances the committee had to meet the studied criticism and active opposition of those occupying high positions in the executive branch of the Government. It was to be expected that every possible obstacle would be placed in the way of the committee by the elements it was created to investigate, but there was no reason to expect that the committee would meet with the opposition of officials of the Government as well.

Under all the circumstances it has done a very commendable job and should be continued in order to complete the work which it has started.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield a half minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my protest against the undemocratic method of procedure by which this resolution is being railroaded through. It is most un-American and unjust.

After having worked for weeks and weeks in preparation of arguments against the continuance of this committee, I find that the opposition is now limited to 13 minutes, to be shared by 15 Members of the House. Just how anyone can adequately present his side of the case in one-half minute is beyond me. I am very much surprised to see that the

Democratic leadership of the House has permitted this procedure. It will not be long before this same leadership will realize that in having allowed this railroad of this resolution through this House, it has created for itself a Frankenstein monster which it will find very embarrassing and destructive. There having been no other alternative left today, I shall avail myself of the privilege allowed to the Members of extending my remarks, and I hereby give my reasons against the continuance of this committee.

At the outset, I state that there is ample need for an investigation of subversive and un-American activities. I am not opposed to any such investigation. In fact, I think it should be carried on by a committee of fact-finding, fair-minded, and impartial Members of this House. My opposition to the continuance of this present committee is that on its record this committee does not possess the qualifications which I have hereinabove outlined. Quite the contrary, this committee is disqualified from continuing any such investigation, and has disqualified itself during its hearings held last year.

Close and careful perusal of the record of the hearings held by the Dies committee will demonstrate to any fair-minded person that instead of conducting a fair and impartial investigation into subversive and un-American activities, it permitted itself to be used by un-American and subversive groups as a sounding board to smear and besmirch the reputations of progressive leaders throughout the country, the labor movement, and progressive Democrats as well. Witness after witness appeared before this committee who was himself un-American and guilty of subversive activities. These witnesses raised a red smoke screen, and did one of the foulest political jobs in the history of this country. These native Nazi representatives used this committee to carry on their dirty Nazi work, that is, to attempt to discredit men and women throughout the country who are seriously engaged in upholding the democratic traditions of our country which those witnesses seek to destroy. Let us examine the record.

First. The chief investigator of this committee who was employed until September 20, 1938, by the committee was one Edward F. Sullivan, who was permitted to go around the country, in California and in Massachusetts in particular, where he released press statements, smearing honest Americans. He was never repudiated by the committee or by its chairman.

On August 25, 1938, labor's Non-Partisan League, in Washington, D. C., submitted to the Dies Committee an 18-page memorandum in which it pointed out among many other things that Sullivan sponsored a witness who had pleaded guilty and who had been sentenced to prison for stealing jewelry from a Washington woman. This witness's name was Alvin I. Halpern.

The press gave a great deal of publicity to this witness as a result of Mr. Sullivan's work with him. It certainly should have been very significant to the committee that the witness Halpern, on the day of his second appearance before the committee, was sentenced to a term of 1 to 2 years for the crime to which he had pleaded guilty. Not a word came from the Dies committee to the effect that it disavowed and rejected the testimony of this witness. It was also pointed out by Labor's Non-Partisan League in its memorandum that Mr. Edward Sullivan attempted to bribe Mr. Walter Gordon, a member of the National Maritime Union, and to have him testify falsely to the effect that the National Maritime Union was a Jewish-controlled Communist organization.

In the same memorandum it was pointed out that Mr. Sullivan had attempted to persuade the attorney for a union to engage in some double-dealing activities against his employer. The attorney, Mr. Angoff, rejected Mr. Sullivan's proffered information.

It was also pointed out in this memorandum that Sullivan had smeared one Leonard Green, organizer for the United Textile Workers, by stating that Green had forced his mother to live in destitution. The reporter who published this story, realizing that it was based on misinformation, revealed that the misinformation was given out by Edward F. Sullivan. The memorandum also pointed out that Sullivan, as revealed



by the La Follette committee, had been employed by the Railroad Audit and Inspection Bureau, a notorious strike-breaking outfit, with a most notorious record.

The memorandum also pointed out that Mr. Sullivan had engaged in anti-Semitic activities, and in activities in which he sought to arouse feeling against both Catholics and Jews.

The committee was also informed that its chief investigator had associated himself with Mr. James True, and shared Mr. True's office in Washington, in the National Press Building, from which office Mr. Sullivan conducted a so-called "Consolidated News Service." Mr. True operated under many names, such as "American First, Inc.," and "James True and Associates." One of the so-called associates was none other than Mr. Sullivan. Mr. True is noted for his invention for which he obtained a patent of a police truncheon which he called "the kike killer." The memorandum also pointed out that Sullivan had addressed a meeting in Asheville, N. C., together with a Mr. Gerald Winrod, whose activity I shall describe later. In his address, as reported in the press, Mr. Sullivan detailed one of the filthiest racial hatred speeches ever recorded.

The memorandum also pointed out to the committee that Mr. Sullivan and his associates were engaged in the presidential campaign in 1936 in the vilest type of attack on the President of the United States. The attacks were based on religious and racial antagonisms. The same group issued the degenerate propaganda called "The White Knight," supposedly the journal of the Knights of the White Camellia.

Just what did the Dies committee do after it had received these facts? The memorandum was documented and accompanied with affidavits and exhibits. An impartial and fair-minded committee seriously seeking facts would have openly repudiated this scoundrel. Instead, we find not a word of condemnation of Sullivan in the report of the committee. Not a word of condemnation of Sullivan in the hearings or in the press from Mr. Dies. In fact, in the exposure of the Asheville conference in the hearings of the committee, volume 3, pages 2385, 2386, Mr. Sullivan's name is omitted from among those present at that conference, even though Mr. Sullivan was one of the two main speakers, and figures prominently in the newspaper accounts of the conference. All that was announced in the press from Mr. Dies with regard to Sullivan was that Mr. Sullivan had been dropped, due to lack of funds. This, I submit, is tender treatment for one who had been permitted by the committee to go around the country destroying reputations in the name of the committee, and who, himself, had been guilty of un-American and subversive activities. This Sullivan incident in and of itself destroys and smashes to smithereens any pretense of fairness and impartiality.

However, the Sullivan incident is not an isolated one. An analysis of the record shows that witnesses with native Nazi connections, and hence un-American and subversive, were permitted to fill pages and pages of the hearings with their foul attacks on many, many outstanding fighters for democracy.

A study of the testimony of these witnesses and a study of the program of the organizations which these witnesses represented, will show that the hearings were used by them to carry out their program, which, in the main, was to discredit the New Deal, discredit the labor movement, discredit progressive causes, and discredit progressive Americans. Foremost among these witnesses from the standpoint of time and numbers of pages consumed was one Walter S. Steele. Who is Walter S. Steele? He is a self-alleged editor of the National Republic magazine. This magazine is definitely anti-New Deal and antilabor in character. In fact, its entire ideology is native Nazi. The magazine is distributed free and unsolicited to school teachers throughout the country, in an obvious attempt to influence their conduct in the classroom. The distribution is paid for by big industrialists at \$1.50 for each so-called annual subscription (source, Senate lobby committee).

Steele claims before the Dies committee that he had never been connected with the Silver Shirts and that he had "absolutely no respect for the Silver Shirts or any such move-

ment" (vol. 1, p. 309, committee hearings). As Steele made this statement under oath he lied and perjured himself. In a series of articles printed from July 30 to August 12, 1937, in the Cleveland Press, Steele is definitely linked with the Silver Shirts in Cleveland through his Cleveland representative and associate editor, Charles A. Kennedy. The reporter who exposed Steele's connection as well as the connection of his associate editor, Charles A. Kennedy, with the Silver Shirt movement, was one William Miller. On Thursday morning when I appeared before the Rules Committee in opposition to the continuance of the Dies committee, I read into the record a telegram which I had received from Mr. Miller that very morning.

I was not satisfied with the evidence from newspaper articles alone. I wanted confirmation from the source, and Mr. Miller, who was the source of these articles, in his telegram pinned Silver Shirt conspiracy on Mr. Steele definitely and conclusively. From the telegram I pointed out to the Committee on Rules that Susan Sterling, who is head of the master council of the Silver Shirts in Cleveland, whose real name is Elsie Theuer, was a very close associate of Charles A. Kennedy and of his coeditor, Walter Steele. Their association in one instance resulted in a conspiracy against the workers in Republic Steel. In fact, Arnold Gingrich, editor of Ken Magazine, definitely linked Miss Sterling with Silver Shirt negotiations with Tom Girdler, in his testimony before the Dies committee, volume 2, page 1226, of the hearings. The telegram which I read from Mr. Miller also established that he had informed, besides releasing this information in the press, Mr. Metcalfe, an investigator for the committee, of all this. He also informed Mr. Metcalfe that in substantiation of what he had printed, there existed a certain Miss Barbara Baker, who had acted as secretary to Susan Sterling. What did the committee do with all of this information that linked its arch witness with the Silver Shirts, an organization which another congressional committee had described as one that was "patterned after the storm troops of Germany"? (p. 11, report of the McCormick committee on un-American and subversive activities). Gingrich, in his testimony (p. 1228 of the hearings, vol. 2), gave the committee both Mr. Miller's name and Miss Baker's name. He also offered to the committee letters from both. The letters were not included in the record. Miss Baker was subpoenaed. She wired Mr. Dies a request for fare to Washington. She received no reply.

From the telegram from which I read to the Rules Committee on Thursday, from Mr. Miller, I showed that on Armistice Day, when the gentleman from Texas went to Cleveland, Miss Baker went to see him to find out what she should do about the subpoena. He stated that a subcommittee would be in Cleveland soon, and that a certain Mr. Howe would get in touch with her. No one ever got in touch with her. A subcommittee did go to Cleveland, and held secret hearings at the Hotel Hollenden. At no time did the subcommittee send for Miss Baker, or Mr. Miller, nor did it direct its investigation on the subject of Tom Girdler, Republic Steel, Susan Sterling, Walter Steele, Charles A. Kennedy, and the Silver Shirt movement in Cleveland. The committee could very well have asked Mr. Steele to have presented his files wherein they would have found many letters from Susan Sterling in which she confided to him what she was doing in helping him in his machinations against real democratic Americans.

What did Chairman Dies himself do? Referring to both of those witnesses, he stated:

Both witnesses were subpoenaed. Mr. Miller denied knowing anything about it. He does not want to come because he says he does not know the facts (p. 2085, vol. 3, of the hearings).

In view of Miss Baker's statement and the statements of Mr. Miller, which I read from his telegram, before the Rules Committee, a most serious issue of fact and veracity is raised here. Surely, Congress should settle this issue before continuing the Dies committee.

If Miller's contentions and Miss Baker's contentions are correct, then I submit that the committee prevented an exposé of Steele's direct complicity with the Silver Shirts.

Let us see just how the Silver Shirts were treated by the Dies committee. I charge that the committee avoided a real investigation of the Silver Shirts. First mention of the Silver Shirts was made at the very beginning of the hearings. This certainly establishes conclusively that the committee had ample time and money to make a thorough investigation of the Silver Shirts. The first day of the hearings, Investigator Metcalfe quoted extensively from a speech of Roy Zachary, field marshal of the Silver Shirts, a speech which is a direct incitement to violence against the Government of the United States and its officials. What did Chairman Dies do? He stated as follows:

We have a great deal of data here on the Silver Shirts, but we will pass it up for the time being and go into it at a later date (vol. 1, p. 47).

The later date never arrived. In fact, the Silver Shirts were mentioned only once in the committee's report, and then only in a passing reference to its type of uniform (committee's report, p. 112).

The Silver Shirts were mentioned several times during the hearings, but only briefly (vol. 2, pp. 1224-1232; vol. 3, pp. 2125, 2237-2245, 2357) without any significant amount of documentation. The manner in which the chairman of the committee turned off the testimony on the Silver Shirts is demonstrated on page 2357, volume 3. Metcalfe was testifying. The chairman asked him for information on the American White Guards, a pro-Nazi organization.

The witness Metcalfe answered with a description of Henry Allen, the director of the organization, and describes him as a liaison man between the Silver Shirts of California and the Gold Shirts in Mexico. Immediately the chairman interrupts him and states: "I think that is enough." Rather than an investigation of the Silver Shirts, I find, as a result of a thorough perusal of the hearings, that no effort whatsoever was made to investigate this notorious, un-American, subversive, anti-Catholic, and anti-Semitic organization. Its leader, William Dudley Pelley, only as recently as January 14 of this year, has boasted that he would not have been investigated. Not only does he boast about his never having been grilled, but he very significantly states that the Dies committee has done good work, in that as he claims the Dies committee has authenticated congressionally what he and the Silver Shirts have been belching for years.

I believe that I have conclusively established in the mind of any reasonable person Steele's connection with the Silver Shirts. I shall now also establish that he lied when he said that he was not connected with any other such movements. Steele is the spokesman, and has so represented himself, of the so-called "American Coalition." The president of the American Coalition is a John B. Trevor, a railroad millionaire heir and a professional immigrant baiter. He is head of the American section of the International Committee to Combat the World Menace of Communism, which is in reality a Nazi international, conducting, internationally, Nazi and anti-Semitic activities out of its Berlin headquarters.

One of the American Coalition's founders was George Sylvester Viereck, a well-known and acknowledged paid Nazi propagandist in the United States, as exposed by the McCormick investigating committee (p. 6, McCormick committee report). A clue to the sinister, subversive, and un-American character of the coalition is the presence among its affiliates of the American Vigilant Intelligence Federation, of which the infamous Harry A. Jung is president. The McCormick Committee on Un-American Activities reported as follows to the Seventy-fifth Congress: "Harry A. Jung and the American Vigilant Intelligence Federation had published and circulated great masses of literature tending to incite racial and religious intolerance" (p. 12). Jung has been a most prolific distributor of the scurrilous forgery, *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. Other samples of his literature are *Halt Gentiles and Salute the Jews*, *Americans Avoid the Dangers of Vicious Dictatorships*, an anti-New Deal pamphlet, and, incidentally, reprinted from Mr. Steele's *National Republic*. Mr. Jung has also been responsible for the pamphlet entitled

"The Man Behind the Men Behind the President," which is a slanderous attack on new Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter. Jung's magazine is a sewer of all the vicious propaganda distributed throughout the country against the President of the United States, the New Deal, and the Jewish people.

In the McCormick report we find that Hon. Henry T. Rainey, late and beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, wrote to Jung as follows:

My files show that you are a sort of detective, worming your way into the homes of the most trusted members of labor organizations and obtaining information with which to combat the efforts of labor organizations to better their conditions, and that you obtain this information for the purpose of assisting "strikebreakers." The data I have shows that you foment strikes in districts where there are no unions and then settle the strike for a price. The information I have with reference to you is that you are the man who does the slimy, stool-pigeon work necessary for the purpose of destroying organized labor wherever it has contractual relations with employers.

Mr. Steele and Mr. Jung are pals.

Steele is also a member of the advisory council of the Paul Reveres, Inc., a pro-Nazi outfit, headed by Col. Edwin Marshall Hadley, who is the author of two anti-Semitic pamphlets issued under the name of Earnest Sincere. The pamphlets are *Facing the Facts* and *Plan and Action*.

Right here the committee, in these two pamphlets, could have found plenty of subversive and un-American material. Hadley also wrote under his real name the pamphlet *Rape of the Republic*, a widely distributed attack on the Roosevelt administration. Steele's magazine expressed its approval of the organization in an article which appeared in the June 1933 issue under the heading "Paul Revere Rides Again." The article, written by Colonel Hadley himself, says: "The National Republic has welcomed this dynamic society into the field of constructive education." All these writings are clearly un-American and subversive.

Steele is in good company. The Paul Reveres was founded by the high priestess of "red" baiters, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, and includes on its advisory board besides Steele, the rabid antisemite Col. E. N. Sanctuary, head of the pro-Nazi American Christian Defenders and coworker of Harry A. Jung in the writing, publishing, and distributing of anti-semitic literature. Sanctuary is, in fact, Jung's eastern representative and an associate of the two most vicious antisemites in America, Robert Edward Edmondson and James True. Edmondson will be remembered as the man who was arrested under charges of criminal libel brought by Mayor LaGuardia and other leading citizens of New York. He is best known as the most prolific writer of antisemitic literature, according to a University of Chicago study by D. S. Strong, published last year, and in recognition of this fact has been invited several times to speak before the Nazi bund in New York City. Again, in the case of Edmondson, antisemitism and anti new dealism are brought together in the person of Howland Spencer, Edmondson's chief backer.

Spencer is the Hudson River aristocrat who sold his estate to Father Divine last summer rather than be a neighbor of President Roosevelt, and in his own name, as the publisher of the newspaper the *Highland Post*, is an anti-Semite and Nazi sympathizer of the first order. Another associate of Colonel Sanctuary is the notorious James True, publisher of the Nazi weekly news letter, *Industrial Control Reports*, who not only preaches violence against Jews, but tried to carry it into practice with the invention of a murderous club which he termed a "kike killer."

These are just a few examples of characters linked with the star witness, Steele, who lied when he said he had no connection with the Silver Shirts, and who lied when he said that he had no connection with any organization like them. Here we find him closely interlinked with the most dangerous, undemocratic, un-American, and subversive groups in the United States. He is the spokesman of these groups, and a coconspirator with the Silver Shirts. Yet Steele was the A No. 1 witness of the Dies committee. The record shows that he certainly took full advantage of the protection and opportunity afforded him by the Dies committee, to carry out



the propaganda program of the Silver Shirts, of the American Vigilant Intelligence Federation, of Harry Jung, of Pelley, of Susan Sterling, and of every propaganda racketeer engaged in seeking to undermine and overthrow our fundamental democratic institutions. The fact that Steele was so protected, the fact that Steele was permitted to use the committee as a sounding board, consuming 453 pages of the hearings, is sufficient to destroy any confidence that any American may ever have had in it.

I further submit that when last week the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] addressed the American coalition assembled here in Washington, in convention, and in view of the native Nazi character of the affiliated groups, he stripped himself of any vestige of impartiality, which is so necessary in the conduct of an investigation of un-American activities. When the chairman of the committee addresses a group and is the guest of a group which is violently engaged in striking at our Bill of Rights, freedom of religion, such as the affiliates of the American Coalition, is he then qualified to investigate them?

The committee evaded a real investigation of native Nazi, anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic organizations. I have shown what happened with regard to the Silver Shirts. I have shown the treatment given to Sullivan. I have shown the star role and protection accorded to Steele. Let us now see what the committee did with regard to the Ku Klux Klan and Gerald B. Winrod.

The Ku Klux Klan is by no means dead. To the contrary, it is very, very active in many sections of the country where the American labor movement is seeking to organize workers, particularly in the South. A. F. of L. and C. I. O. organizers who have felt the terror of the Klan can testify as to its virulent existence. Only as recently as December, the Imperial Wizard of the Klan, Hiram Evans, announced that a national convention would be called to unite their forces against the American labor movement. What treatment did the Klan receive before the committee? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] absolutely refused to go into the Klan. He stated "there is no necessity of going into that."

That has been gone into in days gone by (vol. 3, p. 2376), when witness Metcalfe attempted to offer evidence on this surely subversive and un-American Ku Klux Klan. If what has been gone into in days gone by was to be used as the criterion for exclusion from the scope of the investigation of organizations, then there would have been very, very little work left for the energetic gentleman from Texas.

Let us see how the gentleman from Texas handled Gerald B. Winrod. First, who is Gerald B. Winrod? Gerald B. Winrod is known to his associates as the "Jayhawk Nazi." In his radio programs in Kansas he shocked the entire Nation with his anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic rantings. He shocked the Republicans of Kansas who repudiated him in the Republican primaries when he sought the nomination to the United States Senate. His writings and radio addresses were so low that even the chairman of the Republican National Committee disowned him. His filthiest piece of propaganda was an attack on the Catholic Church in a pamphlet called "The Harlot Woman."

In his magazine, the Defender, of September 1936, he attacks the Roosevelt administration as alien and "red." He assailed the memory of Woodrow Wilson "as Jew-controlled," refers to Ambassador William C. Bullitt as "Jewish Ambassador." A long article on Germany in this issue of the Defender praises Hitler and attacks Catholics and Jews. It defends Hitler as "savior of Germany." And it seeks to justify anti-Catholicism by false charges of immorality and ascribes vile practices to the church and refers to the priests and nuns of the Roman Catholic Church as "filthy priests and nuns." From another one of his magazines, the Revealer, of October 15, 1936, we find a streamer front page headline "Roosevelt's Jewish Ancestry." It presents a chart which it claims "reveals the origin of the sinister spirit which today dominates the White House." To continue a further revelation of this man's writings and rantings against the President, against the Catholic Church, against the Jews, and

against everything that is decent, would only fill up five daily RECORDS. But this alone indicates that Winrod was most certainly a fit subject for the investigation by this committee. But what happened? The witness, Metcalfe, on two separate and distinct occasions was shut off by the committee chairman when he sought to offer testimony on Winrod. Metcalfe offered a copy of Winrod's publication as evidence of his anti-Semitic and anti-Catholic activities. DIES announced that the—

Chair received a letter from Dr. Winrod in which he denied that he had preached anti-Semitism, and denied that he is sympathetic with fascism. He says he is absolutely opposed to fascism and Naziism, and is opposed to racial and religious hatred, and denies that he has disseminated any literature preaching racial or religious hatred. Now, what I want to know is, Have you got anything of his in which he has done that?

Mr. Metcalfe replied that it could be found in the literature in the chairman's possession, and the chairman said "I cannot tell what all this is about" (vol. 3, p. 2373 of the hearings). Later the chairman said to Metcalfe, "As we do not want to do any injustice, of course, you have other evidence besides the question of his own statements?" (vol. 3, p. 2375 of the hearings).

Later during the same testimony Metcalfe reported on a Nation-wide anti-Semitic and pro-Nazi conference held in Kansas City, and attended by representatives of the Silver Shirts, the American Vigilant Intelligence Federation, the German-American Bund, and many others, including Winrod (vol. 3, p. 2387 of the hearings). Metcalfe had been basing his report on his "own information and substantiated by the Department of Justice" (vol. 3, p. 2385 of the hearings). He quoted from a speech by one of the Nazi leaders and said it was substantiated by the Department of Justice (vol. 3, p. 2387 of the hearings). Then he attempted to quote from a speech by Winrod as it was reported by the Department of Justice report. Mr. DIES interrupted him, saying that the Department of Justice had asked that no quotations from the report be given. Mr. Metcalfe then asked: "Do you want the general trend of this?"—indicating paper. Mr. DIES answered: "We will hold this in abeyance. We will respect the wishes of the Department of Justice in this matter" (vol. 3, p. 2387 of the hearings).

It is quite obvious that the chairman of the committee did not overexert himself in investigating Mr. Winrod. Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, in the light of what I have hereinabove revealed, and in the light that the committee's report devotes only a page and a half to native Nazi groups (p. 1718 of the report) it is obvious that the committee not only failed to make a real investigation of these native Nazis, anti-Catholic, anti-Semitic, subversive, and other un-American organizations, but that in some instances its investigator was not given a full and free expression of the result of his investigations of these organizations. I say, yes; by all means let us investigate organizations that conspire to overthrow our democratic form of government, that conspire against our democratic rights, that incite to overthrow the basic doctrine of freedom of religion. There is a real need for such an investigation, and I want it, and I am sure you do. However, let us not become confused. We cannot do this job through the continuance of this committee. This is clearly established on the record of its past performance. I challenge contradiction.

**THE SPEAKER.** The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

**MR. SABATH.** Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

**MR. DINGELL.** Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the very outset that I am most anxious that the task assigned to the Un-American Activities Committee be completed in the most thorough fashion and at the earliest possible date. Accordingly I will support any proposal to clothe a representative committee of this House with authority to act vigorously in the pursuit of the original purpose, granting such committee whatever amount of money is necessary to ferret out subversive movements which threaten our democracy. I feel,

however, that the so-called Dies committee has made some very serious errors which gave the country the impression that Frank Murphy is a Communist, that our Detroit schools are shot through with communism, and that our school teachers are injecting the virus of un-Americanism into the tender beings of our school children. Of course, nothing could be further from the truth, and nothing in the world could be more helpful to communism than to link with it the respected names of some of our best citizens, holding office or in private life. Churchmen of various denominations were placed in this same category by publicity seekers and by men of doubtful character without the opportunity of defending themselves.

The committee is not altogether to blame for this erroneous propaganda broadcast throughout the Nation, but it is to blame for the lack of proper safeguards for its willingness to summon and pay the expenses of people who may have had ulterior motives. The committee is charged with a great responsibility and should therefore issue, after hearing properly qualified witnesses, statements to the press. Other great committees of the House, notably the McCormack committee, performed splendid service without destroying the reputations of innocent and good citizens. The people have a right to expect the protection of their good names and, more than that, a right of defending themselves. It is the looseness of performance that I criticize. It is the method which caused a miscarriage of the intent of the House of Representatives and destroyed reputations which were spotless in their loyalty and patriotism that I protest against. The few brief moments I have to discuss this important matter will not permit me to go into detail. I criticize the House for its parsimony, for penny pinching, for the niggardly appropriation of \$25,000 for an investigation of a billion-dollar propaganda system rooted in alienism and foreign soil. I am willing and anxious to appropriate any amount necessary to do a good job in any investigation that will uncover and drive out any and all "isms" and subversive movements.

I contend that right or wrong the confidence of many of our people, insofar as the Dies committee is concerned, has been destroyed. The committee has lost face, lost effectiveness for the future, and all that I propose is that the House vote down the previous question in order that the resolution might be amended to permit the Speaker to name a new committee to carry on with utmost vigor and perseverance.

All that I want to do is to substitute the adjective "the" for the vowel "a" in line 1 of the resolution. Certainly our great Speaker can be trusted to rename members of the committee and add other reputable and aggressive members, equal in ability and character with those previously named, who can continue the work, profiting by the mistakes heretofore made. I have the highest regard for my friend from Texas, and he knows I am sincere in saying so. We have worked together before, and he will concede that I am as eager as he is to extirpate un-American activities from our national life. I believe he should, in the interest of restoring public confidence, join with others in this House toward the creation of a new and greater committee.

Dynamic and personable, the chairman of the committee made a great mistake when he rushed his investigation to such an extent as to deprive the committee of the services of two of its most valuable and distinguished members. I refer to my colleagues, Mr. DEMPSEY, from New Mexico, and Mr. HEALEY, from Massachusetts. Nothing was gained by the haste and much was lost in their being deprived of an opportunity to serve as the House intended.

I hope the committee will itself acquiesce and accept the amendment. It is vital to the Nation in that it will permit immediate and accelerated action without any handicap or suspicion.

We need more than anything else at this time, Mr. Speaker, legislation with teeth in it to curb these subversive activities and to destroy them.

We know of their existence, and rather than investigate let us as rapidly as possible legislate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, my own views on this subject can be found in the Appendix of the RECORD on page 385. I will not have time to give them here.

I have no time to speak, except to say that the type of appeal that has been made on the Republican side of the House for the passage of this resolution is illustrative of the thing that I fear, namely, a concerted attempt to identify every clean, decent American progressive movement in defense of the rights of the common people of this country with communism. If that spirit continues, I say our country is in danger. [Applause.] My reason for saying that is that I believe we have got to have room for honest divergences of opinion on the problems we face without trying to link our opponents with some un-American movement. Unless we keep alive the spirit of tolerance and fair play we are in danger of losing our liberties. Turn loose a vindictive spirit of hate and prejudice and it will be hard to control.

The work of the Dies committee, insofar as it has consisted of revealing facts about communism, nazi-ism, and fascism in this country, is a work in which everyone believes and all favor. Were this committee not continued I should certainly favor the setting up of another committee to carry on that work.

The reason I shall vote against continuing the Dies committee is simply that I cannot put my stamp of approval on what has happened to the reputations of a great many sincere, patriotic people in this country. To call in question a man's patriotism and devotion to the welfare of his country is a most serious thing. Any committee dealing with matters of that kind ought to be as judicious in its conduct, as careful not to allow publicity to be given to unsubstantiated charges as it can possibly be. If it is, then the force of what it has to say will be the greater. But if it is not, then people may be condemned before they have fair opportunity for defense, and the mere accusation, however false, before a congressional committee may carry in an inflamed public mind an appearance of validity which the same accusation made elsewhere could not have.

My vote against continuation of this committee is a vote of protest against its methods. I imagine the resolution will be adopted. If it is, I can only hope that the investigation will be effective in bringing to light facts regarding movements seeking to overthrow our constitutional democracy and substitute any sort of dictatorship for it; and I can only also hope that the mistakes of the past will be avoided.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, if there was ever any doubt whether the un-American investigation by the Dies committee has been resolved into an attack on the President of the United States and his administration, it would have been removed by the language of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and other Members on the Republican side of the House. As far as I am concerned, with 160 Republicans to smear Roosevelt and the New Deal—and that is all they have done so far in this session—I do not see the necessity of wasting the taxpayers' money to furnish a Democratic committee to supply the dirt. I do not blame the Republicans. It is talked around the Chamber that the activities of this committee so far has emptied a number of Democratic seats in this Chamber, and they no doubt hope they will empty a lot more in 1940. [Applause.]

The attack is necessarily on the President, and the tail goes along with the hide. If a Communist sympathizer is now at the head of the Department of Justice, the President appointed him. If the Department of Labor is sympathetic to communism, the President is responsible. If the W. P. A. is honeycombed with communism, the President is responsible. If, as charged by the chairman of the committee, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Labor, the Attorney General, and other governmental agencies here in Washington have sought to thwart



and discredit the committee, they all are the President's appointees—he must be cognizant of their actions and he must be in sympathy with them. It is the President who is being hit over the shoulders of these subordinates.

Every speech on this subject made on the Republican side of the aisle is filled with insinuations and sneers against the President, and every thrust at him is loudly applauded on that side of the aisle. They go as far as they dare to say that he is openly countenancing an alliance between the Democratic Party and communism in this country. They want to destroy him and his works. No Democrat can shut his eyes to this, or gainsay it, although many of them talk one way in the cloak room and vote the other way on the floor. They will do it on this resolution.

The course which the Democratic Party began in the last Congress, and which it is continuing in this Congress, is alienating the progressive and labor forces to which it owes its place and power.

There is nothing for us on the other side of the fence. We would not be trusted by the interests which have been so long and so well served by the Republican Party. What I fear is that the course of this committee is having the effect of identifying in the public mind new dealism, liberalism, and labor, with radicalism and communism, and that it will serve to still further demoralize and divide the Democratic membership in Congress and discredit the administration nationally.

It may go beyond this. I have no doubt that every charge of communism against the administration registers in Berlin and Rome, where democracy and communism are already identified. Already the dictators identify the democracies of Europe in the category of Russia, and we are furnishing the same ammunition to be shot at us.

This committee had assigned to it a most important work, and it ought to be reconstituted so that that work could be carried out as intended. Even its friends on the floor admit that it has gone afield, and the fact is that it has gone further afield than they admit. If it keeps on, it will dig more graves for Democrats than for Communists.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

The SPEAKER. There is one-half minute remaining. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my decisive objection to the continuation of the Dies committee.

I base my opposition to the renewal of the life of this investigating body upon its manner of procedure as revealed in the printed copy of its hearings. I likewise voice my protest against the omission by the committee to make a thorough and painstaking investigation of Fascist and Nazi organizations in the United States. We have Silver Shirts, German-American bunds, Ku Klux Klan, Christian Party, anti-Semitic organizations flourishing in this broad land, but the committee paid scant attention to their nefarious activities.

The heads of these organizations are known, their addresses readily available, their books and accounts subject to subpoena. Why was this not done?

Mr. Speaker, the effect of this committee has been to inculcate in the minds of the gullible an impression that many of the most reputable citizens in our land are Communists, or dupes of communism. One witness testified that Shirley Temple had lent herself to communism. One witness charged the Lt. Gov. Ellis Patterson, of California, was a Communist. The same witness stated that Labor's Non-Partisan League was under the Communist control in California (hearings, p. 2033). On page 2034 of the hearings we find these ex parte charges:

The State of California has \* \* \* as candidates \* \* \* the following: Culbert Olson for Governor, who fraternizes with and accepts the program of the Communist Party. Ellis Patterson for Lieutenant Governor, a member of the Communist Party. Sheridan Downey, for United States Senator, was a running mate of Communist (sic) Upton Sinclair in 1934. \* \* \* To further establish evidence of the candidates listed above \* \* \*

LXXXIV—71

I categorically charge that the foregoing statements are falsehoods. Among reasons given by Witness Knowles for the conclusion that these men are Communists is that a Communist newspaper spoke in friendly terms about some of them; that one of them was a visitor at a Non-Partisan League meeting; that greetings relative to world peace emanating from one of the men charged were read at a meeting of the American League Against War and Fascism; that the Commonwealth Federation had spoken in kindly fashion of one of them; that the three men had urged that Tom Mooney be pardoned. Ye gods and little fishes! To what a low degree have we sunk when reputable citizens are thus indicted before a congressional agency in their absence by innuendo, gossip, guesses, hearsay, and wishful thinking.

The American Civil Liberties Union is subjected to vitriolic attack before this same committee—hearings, page 2039 and the following. The statement is blandly made that the majority of the board of directors of this organization "are so well known nationally for their Communist activities that any comment thereon would be superfluous." The author of this remarkable statement may insist that comment would be superfluous, but I make so bold as to comment. The general counsel of this organization is one of America's most eminent lawyers, Mr. Arthur Garfield Hays. In a radio broadcast recently Mr. Hays stated:

I realize we should not too harshly condemn men like the honorable Congressman from Texas [Mr. Dies]. Lack of understanding of what Americanism means is largely responsible for their acts. \* \* \* They know little of philosophy or history; they fail to appreciate what democracy means. It cannot be expected that these men would understand the Bill of Rights, for to them the only permissible views are those which they approve. \* \* \* These men start with a will to believe—a will to believe those witnesses who, because of ignorance, prejudice, malice, personal aggrandizement, desire for publicity \* \* \* come before a committee and are permitted to express opinions which, since they are the opinions of the committee, are accepted by the committee as facts.

The American Civil Liberties Union was repeatedly attacked by witnesses appearing before the committee. In the report of the committee we find these words:

From the evidence before us we are not in a position to definitely state whether or not the American Civil Liberties Union can properly be classed as a Communist organization.

The inference is plain. The impression sought to be created in the credulous mind is obvious, but the purpose of evidence is to enable one to report what he can state, not what he cannot state. This organization repeatedly requested that the Dies committee permit its officers to be heard, but the requests went unanswered. When the committee had concluded its hearings, the privilege was vouchsafed the union, as to other accused organizations, of submitting an affidavit to which nobody paid any attention and to which no reference is made in the committee's report. In investigating the union, however, the committee invited none of its officers to testify. Among members of long standing, or of the national committee of the American Civil Liberties Union, will be found some of the leading intellectuals and most brilliant thinkers in the United States, citizens of all political persuasions, whose patriotism it is outrageous to question. Among these will be found William Allen White, publisher of the *Emporia (Kans.) Gazette*, America's foremost newspaper editor; William E. Dodd, Sr., great educator and writer, former Ambassador to Germany; Bishop Edgar Blake, of the Methodist Church; Felix Frankfurter, now Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; Prof. John Dewey, America's greatest living philosopher; Dr. Lloyd Garrison, dean of the Harvard Law School; Col. William J. Donovan, eminent lawyer, one of our most prominent Republicans; Dr. Mary E. Woolley, perhaps the leading feminine teacher in America. It might be added parenthetically that when Felix Frankfurter was nominated by the President as Justice of the United States Supreme Court an attempt was made in the Judiciary Committee of another body to question his fitness for the high judicial post because of his activities in connection with the American Civil Liberties Union. So shatteringly did Mr. Frankfurter refute the aspersions that the committee unanimously reported his nomination favorably; and in another body of this

Congress not a single vote was registered against his confirmation, though he had been active for years as a member of the American Civil Liberties Union.

This organization believes in free speech and assemblage, even for unpopular views. It has defended the rights of Negroes in the South, the Ku Klux Klan in Boston, radicals in California, evolutionists in Tennessee. It has fought for Tom Mooney, for the Scottsboro Negroes. It has defended Henry Ford against an order of the Labor Board which denied him the right to spread antiunion propaganda. It has befriended unpopular religious groups. Recently, United States District Judge Clark handed down a decision in which will be found these significant words:

Plaintiff, American Civil Liberties Union, was established and is maintained for the purpose of taking such measures as it deems lawful and essential for the enforcement of the rights secured by the first amendment and the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States. \* \* \* The purposes of the plaintiffs above set forth are in the letter and spirit of our Constitution and laws and of the theory of our democratic institutions. \* \* \* There is no competent proof that the plaintiffs or any of them had any other purpose. \* \* \*

Despite the desirability of exposure of un-American activities, it seems perfectly obvious from the record that any committee under Congressman DIES is wholly incapable of giving the American public a fair inquiry or honest conclusions. Any such investigation will be weighted on the side of reaction and against the progressive program overwhelmingly supported by the American public. One cannot resist the suspicion that the demand for 2 years more of these sensation-seeking antics rests upon a desire to affect the 1940 national election. Is Congress to put into the hands of a committee with this record the weapons to do on a national scale what it accomplished in part on a local scale in the last elections? Or does the public want what I believe it does, an honest exposure of foreign propaganda aimed at our American form of government?

If that is the case, the job can be done either by the Department of Justice, fully equipped to investigate and ferret out the violators of law and to recommend needed laws, or by a joint committee of House and Senate, which would rise above the suspicion of reactionary partisan ends.

Nor are 2 years needed to expose the enemies of democracy and to recommend legislation against them. Congress can now adopt legislation to end any preparations for violence against our democratic institutions by passing a bill already introduced to prohibit private military training or the use of arms by private organizations. American law is otherwise wholly adequate to protect our liberties. The conspiracy statutes, the law requiring the registration of agencies engaged in foreign propaganda, the immigration and deportation acts, these and others protect our democracy in law.

Recently a committee of 150 lawyers of national repute made an investigation of the activities of the Dies committee and drew up a report thereon consisting of 40 pages. A casual reading of this report will reveal in countless instances the bias of the Dies committee and the undignified manner of its procedure. I commend its reading to all of you.

In the debates preceding the adoption of the original Dies committee resolution (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 3d sess., 75th Cong., May 26, 1938, p. 9961) the gentleman from Texas, in the course of his remarks designed to reveal the need for such a committee, said:

I am not inclined to look under every bed for a Communist, but I can say to this House that there is in my possession a mass of information showing the establishment and operation of some 30 Nazi camps in the United States. \* \* \*

Arguing in favor of the adoption of the resolution, Mr. DIES stated he was conscious of the possible abuse of the immense power granted to a congressional committee and assured his colleagues that his committee would not be guilty of such abuse:

I can conceive that a committee constituted or composed of men whose objectives are to gain publicity or whose object it is to arouse hatred against some race or creed, or to do things of that sort, might do more harm than good.

In the public press, Mr. DIES was quoted on June 19, 1938:

This is not going to be any "shooting in the dark" inquiry. We want the facts only. \* \* \*

I submit that anyone who takes the time to read the hearings of the Dies committee must unavoidably come to the conclusion that the committee has been culpable of actions and conduct that are most reprehensible. I exculpate from responsibility in this connection, however, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY]. Approximately 90 percent of the hearings reveal the chairman's cross-questioning and exclusive handling of the hearing.

The question is, Has the committee sought and obtained facts rather than opinions and conclusions? Has it ever defined the amazing word "un-American"? Has it not, rather, pictured any citizen of liberal or progressive leanings as being tainted by the virus of communism? Could any lawyer of experience enthuse over the admission of inadmissible evidence? Are we justified by the past conduct of the committee in continuing its operation?

Is a Congress which reduced the appropriation to provide work for the unemployed in the amount of \$150,000,000 in a position logically to authorize the expenditure of a large sum of money to ascertain whether discontent exists in the United States?

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] has properly asked why it would not be sensible to investigate the causes of subversive activity. The wonder to me is that we do not have more Fascists or Communists, when we recall how many millions of our citizens are ill-housed and undernourished and lack a job. The committee is seeking to find out facts which are already well known. In recent years two similar committees have functioned, albeit in a different manner. These were known as the McCormack and Fish committees. The former committee made numerous recommendations of what it deemed to be needed legislation. Congress ignored all these recommendations. Facts concerning subversive activities are readily available if vigorous inquiry is made at the source. The Department of Justice has the means, the facilities, and the experience readily at hand to carry on an extensive investigation into all forms of subversive activities. I join with those who praise the objectives of the Dies committee, but I deplore the poverty, denial of opportunity, poor housing, which breed the unrest which eventuates into Communist or Fascist organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I condemn the failure of the Dies committee to hear both sides of the controversy. I censure the committee for allowing its forum to be used as a sounding board for the dissemination of politics. I condemn the timing of committee testimony in the heat of a political campaign. I deplore the fact that unsupported testimony of a damaging nature was permitted without previous investigation and in open session. I regret that a committee would allow witnesses of dubious antecedents to give publicity to slanderous utterances before a tribunal which the law has surrounded with legal immunity. If these witnesses had made the same statement elsewhere, they could have been held to strict account by the reputable citizens impugned. Publicity emanating from this committee contributed to the defeat of Gov. Frank Murphy, of Michigan, and of Elmer Benson, of Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, the opponents of the continuation of the Dies committee were allowed only 13 minutes of the entire debate today. This resolution is being railroaded through this House without careful consideration. The effect of the committee's conduct may well be to undermine the great Democratic Party. I predict that no single Republican will vote against this resolution this afternoon. Our Republican friends are gloating with glee over the fact that some Democratic partners will aid them in an effort to defeat the Democrats. Two Cabinet ministers, Ickes and Perkins, were assailed before this committee. Shall we be a party to attack upon the New Deal? I refuse to join the crew which seeks to wreck the New Deal.



Mr. Speaker, when I lose the courage to vote my convictions in this body I will resign. I refuse to cringe my knees before the whip of reaction. I refuse to offer incense upon the altar of intolerance. I quote the language of the President of the United States with reference to the Dies committee. Said Franklin D. Roosevelt:

Most fair-minded Americans hope that the committee will abandon the practice of merely providing a forum to those who for political purposes or otherwise seek headlines which they could not otherwise obtain. Mere opinion evidence has been barred in court since the American system of legislative and judicial procedure was started. \* \* \* I was disturbed \* \* \* because a congressional committee, charged with the responsibility of investigating un-American activities, should have permitted itself to be used in a flagrantly unfair and un-American attempt to influence an election.

By special permission I append hereto brief excerpts from magazine and newspaper comments and editorials with reference to the Dies committee. I do so because most of the periodicals quoted are conservative, politically speaking, but the comments are illuminating as illustrative of the fact that not only among all liberal organizations in the United States will be found heated opposition to the continuation of this committee, but likewise from intelligent, fair, and reasonable conservatives.

[From the Time Magazine of November 7, 1938]

Fate and Texas gave MARTIN DIES an impressive physique, a durable voice, a seat in Congress. Mr. Dies lately has given the United States a congressional investigation. By the standards of past masters at inquisition, his performance has not been brilliant. Ex-Senator (now Associate Justice) Hugo L. Black was at his best with a hostile witness, knowing well how to bait the trap, when to spring it. Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE also knows the uses of the subtle query. Mr. Dies knows chiefly how to bellow. Last week he had the thrill of seeing his bellowing affect not just the ear of some baffled layman but the tympanums of that knowing politician, the head of the Democratic Party.

To his investigation \* \* \* Mr. Dies had brought principally \* \* \* a willingness (common to congressional ferrets) to hear what he believes, a succession of renegade leftists, ex-union officers and members turned talebearer, avowed spies, patriotic citizens bursting with information about the "reds." Mr. Dies has also taken testimony about United States Nazis and Fascists \* \* \*. But in the main he has stayed on the "red" trail.

[From The Nation of November 12, 1938]

When the House gets around to inquire into the misuse of its power by the Dies committee, it should not fail to inquire into the circumstances surrounding the service of those subpoenas. Before that time arrives, the La Follette Civil Liberties Committee may save the House some trouble by exposing the activities of the Associated Farmers, and the relations between that organization and Fascist and Nazi propagandists. Then, and not before, we may learn about the un-American activities which constitute a real threat to this country's institutions. How illuminating it would be to discover that persons engaged in those activities have been using the Dies committee as a loudspeaker for their propaganda. \* \* \* Dies claimed a right to broadcast an attack on his critics, but insisted that it was un-American to permit one of them to answer him.

[From the Nation of November 5, 1938]

From the beginning the committee's performances have been a travesty on orderly procedure. Hundreds of thousands of words of "testimony" and "documentary evidence" have been pumped into the record without the slightest pretense of ascertaining whether it was true or false, whether the witnesses were credible or whether they were actuated by ulterior motives—as many of them so palpably were. No effort was made to protect exalted reputations against unsupported calumny. \* \* \* This obscene and degrading hippodrome is being carried on by authority of Congress, and \* \* \* its real aim is to defame and defeat fine public officials such as Governor Murphy and Governor Benson.

[From the Christian Century of December 7, 1938]

Essentially the same method has been used to make the public believe that their Government itself is honeycombed with communism, and that the end which liberal and forward-looking Government officials have in view is the establishment of a Communist state in America. In doing this the Dies committee has been engaged in its most subversive, its most destructive work. Ostensibly formed to investigate un-American activities, it has itself set out to undermine the confidence of the American people in their own Government. By equating the mildest form of liberalism with communism, the Dies committee has been trying to persuade the American people that such Government officers and other leaders as have been trying to remedy some of the most obvious abuses

which have flourished under our form of democracy have, in reality, been traitorous reds whose real end is the destruction of American society. If such a panic can be induced, if the American people can be duped into believing that every attempt to end or lessen a social evil covers an attempt to establish communism in this country, then Mr. Dies and those who cheer him on can hope for a delivery of the Government into the hands of reaction. \* \* \* Mr. Dies wants to go on spreading among the American people distrust of their own Government. He is about to ask Congress for almost 10 times as much money as he has already had to continue and extend his attempt to foster panic. No Congressman with the slightest sense of responsibility to America's democratic institutions can be willing to supply the Dies committee with another cent.

[From the New Haven Journal-Courier of December 5, 1938]

#### EXTENDING DIES PROBE

Suggestions are beginning to appear at Washington for a neat way out of the difficulties of the Dies committee. The extreme anguish caused leftists by the testimony before the committee indicates that there is something in what the witnesses say. At the same time competent students of congressional procedure say the committee has been less fair, even, than some of the New Deal witch-burning expeditions. The administration naturally can't choke off the committee; an effort to do that would force a further investigation of the curious resistance the committee has met in administration quarters.

But why can't a compromise be struck which would meet the arguments of the leftists insofar as they go to the fairness of the procedure? Why can't Congress appropriate another sum for another committee to be staffed by persons less suspect of original bias and more solicitous of reputations than the Dies group has been? That we want to keep on knowing about Fascist and Communist activities goes without saying. The overwhelming majority of Americans are middle-of-the-roads, who will insist on that. A new committee or a correction of the procedure of the old might be the way ahead.

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of December 10, 1938]

#### NOT WORTH 200 CENTS

Chairman Dies will seek \$200,000 from Congress with which to continue his erratic inquiries into the state of our civilization, but it is difficult to see why 200 cents should be appropriated for this purpose.

Has there ever been such a forum before for irresponsible witnesses wishing to air irrelevant, and often absurd, charges? Take for example, the statement made before the committee of a young minister that "Jimmy" Roosevelt is undermining true Americanism by not contributing to the church. "Jimmy" says he made such contributions and failed to put them in his income-tax returns, but suppose he contributed nothing. Is that a proper and relevant subject for discussion by a congressional committee which is supposed to be ferreting out the subversive elements in our society?

And then there is the testimony of Latham R. Reed, described as a retired Army colonel. The Dies committee has just listened for a considerable time to his attacks on Secretary Ickes. A central point in the assault is that the Secretary spoke at the annual dinner of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York a year ago, and made an address which Reed regarded as "distinctly radical." His address "wound up with an unwarranted attack on the Supreme Court."

And so what? Secretary Ickes' address was published in the newspapers of the country on December 9, 1937. It doesn't take a congressional committee, spending the taxpayers' money, to discover its content. And does it really make any difference whether Latham R. Reed thought it was radical?

This same witness delivered himself of some "revelations" concerning Felix Frankfurter, the distinguished law teacher at Harvard. It seems that Mr. Frankfurter is on the board of the American Civil Liberties Union. Since his name has been on the letterhead of the organization for years, this isn't exactly news. Yet the committee solemnly questioned Reed concerning this fact, and asked if this is the same Mr. Frankfurter who is being prominently mentioned for the Supreme Court.

All of which could have been ascertained without any congressional inquiry, and with a lot less noise and excitement than this haywire Dies investigation is kicking up. Why appropriate any more money for such an irrational investigation?

[From the Seattle Daily Times of December 10, 1938]

#### SHOULD HAVE BEEN THROWN OUT

From the start of hearings by the Dies committee the need of legal counsel, of guidance according to rules of common courtesy and common sense, has been painfully apparent. Chairman MARTIN DIES once practiced law, but whether because of excess zeal or bad judgment he has been sadly remiss at times in the amenities that would be required in any well-conducted courtroom. The committee's eagerness for facts has been matched by its indulgence of fantasy in listening to many witnesses; but for letting one of these babble his belief that James Roosevelt had given nothing of his income to churches or to charity, Chairman DIES and his associates can offer no acceptable excuse. Even if the tale were true, as of

course it isn't, what would be the bearing upon un-American activities and propaganda? An instinct of decency should have prompted some member of the committee to halt such ridiculous and impertinent testimony and throw the witness out.

[From the Minneapolis Star of December 13, 1938]

#### SHABBY TACTICS

How the evidence before the Dies committee is slandered to put it in the worst possible light is demonstrated in the effort to smear David J. Saposs, chief economist of the N. L. R. B., who 7 years ago wrote the following:

"... the Socialist movement must tell the people that capitalism cannot be stabilized \* \* \* the workers must be prepared to stretch arms across the frontiers in case of war and definitely win power for themselves."

There's dynamite in those words.

But here's the pay-off. Mr. Saposs was reporting a meeting of the Socialist International in Vienna and quoting what its delegates said.

By quoting part of the report without its context, it is easy to set up Mr. Saposs as a wild-eyed "red," a man expressing radical opinions instead of reporting them. But it does seem a shabby trick for a congressional committee to stoop to.

[From the Tampa Morning Tribune of November 26, 1938]

#### "PURVEYORS OF HATE"

Congressman DIES, who does entirely too much talking, has taken it upon himself, for no apparently good reason, to select what he calls an international team of "purveyors of hate." His purpose, he said, is to inform the American people that "what is happening in Europe in spreading hatred is gradually taking place in this country."

He divided his team into two divisions, one, "purveyors of class hatred," headed by Josef Stalin, and the other "purveyors of racial and religious hatred," led by Adolf Hitler and Benito Mussolini.

In the American division of the "purveyors of class hatred" he placed John L. Lewis, Secretary Ickes, Harry Hopkins, Earl Browder, Clarence Hathaway—who, he said, was editor of the Daily Worker—James Ford, Negro Communist; Paul Sifton, assistant to the Federal Wage and Hour Administrator; and David Saposs, economist of the National Labor Relations Board.

His selection for the American division of the "purveyors of racial and religious hatred" included Fritz Kuhn, leader of the German-American Bund, and William Pelley, whom he described as head of the Silver Shirts.

DIES announced that he would make additions to his "team" from time to time, saying that at the close of the year, "we may award a medal with a rattlesnake on it to the one who has performed the greatest service for hatred."

It is the privilege of the Texas Congressman to exercise his fertile brain as he pleases, but it is entirely improper for him, as a Member of Congress and the head of an important body of that Congress supposed to conduct an impartial and unprejudiced governmental investigation, to arbitrarily and opprobriously characterize and accuse any American citizen. This outburst qualifies Dies himself for a conspicuous place among his "purveyors of hate."

[From the Galveston Daily News of December 1, 1938]

#### REPRESENTATIVE DIES' DEMANDS

In a letter to Secretary Hull, Representative DIES demands prosecution of the Communist Party, the German-American Bund, and some 20 other organizations for failure to register as agents of foreign principals. If the courts were as careless about proof as Representative DIES has been in his conduct of the investigation into un-American activities, doubtless these organizations would be indicted and convicted.

All that would be necessary would be for someone to get on the witness stand and express an opinion that the accused organizations were guilty. Since courts must abide by the law and rules of evidence, however, it is unlikely that the State Department will act on Mr. DIES' demand.

If the law required registration of organizations and individuals which foster alien principles a prima facie case could be made out against the Communist Party and the German-American Bund, and perhaps some of the organizations which Representative DIES names as "fronts" for the Communist Party. But the law applies only to those who are acting directly as agents of foreign principals, whereas it is doubtful if anything more definite could be proved against the organizations Representative DIES accuses than that they derive their inspiration from foreign sources. Prosecutions can't be sustained on evidence of inspiration, of course.

Sometimes one is tempted to regret this limitation, but it is evident upon reflection that if the limitation were removed freedom presently would vanish in this country as completely as it has in the lands whose systems our Communists and Nazis are so anxious to have us adopt. Compelling the Communist Party and the German-American Bund to register as agents of Russian and German political organizations, or fining them for failure to register, would not affect their public standing. Any American who doesn't know what they represent is beyond enlightenment.

[From the Utica (N. Y.) Press of November 26, 1938]

#### NOT THE MAN FOR THE JOB

The House of Representatives had a good purpose when it created a committee to investigate un-American activities. There may be many subversive movements under way which hold nothing good for the country. If this is the case, it would be wise for the Government to know the facts. By the same token, if radical propaganda has little influence, people could begin to consider more important matters.

But Representative MARTIN DIES, of Texas, is not the man to head any such inquiry. He has shown himself to be either gullible or motivated by personal considerations in using the committee as a sounding board for his own ideas. The public is growing a bit tired of them.

It is a waste of time, for instance, for him to say that Secretaries Ickes and Perkins should resign. He includes Harry Hopkins, of the W. P. A., in his list of administration officials who should retire. Mr. DIES must know that they will not resign merely because he says so, and he cannot force them into retirement. We might just as well say that Hitler should return to private life, but refrain from doing so because of a reluctance to be made to look ridiculous.

[From the Waco (Tex.) News-Tribune of November 30, 1938]

#### TEXAS IS BLUSHING

Texas has furnished the man for one of the most spectacular of those publicity parades known as congressional investigations but Texas will get little satisfaction out of the show.

Congressman MARTIN DIES has kept up the tradition of these congressional inquiries. He has made his as sensational as any, and he has drained the last drop of publicity out of his opportunity.

Like many others, his inquiry started out with a good purpose. The purpose is still good, but the procedure has discredited itself. The aim to expose subversive activities by any alien group, or any group, is sound.

High points so far have been the testimony about Shirley Temple, and Mr. DIES' vociferous complaint that Senator CONNALLY was informed before DIES was about approval of a Government project in Texas.

Texas legislature has had a lot of experience with these blunderbuss inquiries. Usually, if there is a specific purpose, it gets lost in the divergence of ideas of committee members. But the main trouble is that such a hearing opens up the gates for the gathering of a crowd of nuts, of disgruntled or discredited people, of wild-minded fanatics on some subject, and pours their vapory imaginings into the form of sworn testimony, much of it just as responsible as the dreams of a psychopathic ward's battiest inmate.

Mr. DIES isn't to be blamed. But his constituents and the people of Texas may well wonder if he is doing them any service while he labors so diligently and, from this distance, seems to fail so completely, to expose and uproot wrong influences detrimental to democratic government.

DIES himself, in a speech before the Texas Legislature, got off a statement that implies more danger to free America, if anyone with the will was in power to carry it through, than he has exposed. He expounded the need of Government power to curb "criticism of public officials, such as yourselves." He may not hold that view now, and his work in the committee has been to afford a forum for criticism of nearly everything; and Mr. DIES has not hesitated to criticize officials, such as Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Ickes, Mr. Hopkins, and so on.

We'd a little rather Maine or Minnesota, California, or Connecticut were furnishing the present committee leadership.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Herald-Post of December 9, 1938]

#### "SCREW BALLS"

Chairman DIES, of the House Committee Investigating Un-American Activities, comes to the defense of some of his witnesses who have been charged with being "screw balls."

We think, however, that Mr. DIES might better spend his time defending himself and his committee. Never before that we can recall has an opportunity to render patriotic service, which is badly needed, been so bungled. For sheer incompetency the Dies committee has set a record that, we hope, for the sake of the Nation, is never approached.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Times of November 29, 1938]

#### IS SANTA A "RED"?

Unless the Dies committee of the House, appointed to investigate un-American activities, is supplied with additional funds by the incoming Congress, "it will have little definite to report," admits the Buffalo Evening News. Truer words never were written. Few investigating committees ever did less to justify their existence than the Dies committee.

#### Y. W. C. A. NOW UNDER SUSPICION

The latest example of the committee's antics is to be found in Cleveland, where Harold C. Mosier, Dies subcommittee chairman, is responsible for the statement that communistic influences have been detected in the Young Women's Christian Association, Cleveland churches, and Ohio schools.



First it was Shirley Temple, then it was Gypsy Rose Lee, and now it's the Y. W. C. A.

We advise Santa Claus to change the color of his costume and be quick about it.

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) Herald of December 2, 1938]  
SIDE SHOW

Chairman DIES, of the now infamous Un-American Committee, wants \$200,000 from the taxpayers to continue his show for 2 more years.

Considering his results on the \$25,000 Congress originally gave him, DIES should be able to stage a superextravaganza if he gets his wish. The Texan probably would be willing to guarantee to find a Communist in every precinct and to unearth convincing proof George Washington was a lifelong Marxian. Anything should be possible to a statesman who has made a "red" menace out of Shirley Temple.

But for the taxpayers to spend more on this side show is another question. We all have had our laugh; the joke has gone far enough. If DIES is encouraged to pull any more red-flannel spooks from under the bed and out of the closet, the aforesaid spooks might become so numerous they would tote Representative DIES plumb away to never-never land.

[From the Minot (N. Dak.) News of December 6, 1938]  
"RED" HUNTING

Speaking of the Communist probe conducted by the Dies committee, which seems to have started out on a legitimate quest and then got itself snarled up, an observer writes in the Cleveland Plain Dealer:

"We have had a lot of 'red' hunts, but none that backfired more quickly. The principal weakness of all of them is that the inquisitors have no sense of humor."

There is communism in this country, and it would be a useful public service to show its extent and operation. But obviously the American public as a whole doesn't take it very seriously. Most people would probably say that, as regards the two perils at opposite ends of our political spectrum, there is probably more danger of fascism than communism.

However that may be, it is obviously better for an inquisitorial body to cover both of these alien systems than to concentrate on one and ignore the other. Also, when conducting hearings on any matter of controversy, to hear both sides.

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Times of December 9, 1938]  
NEW LOW RECORD

The Dies committee investigating un-American activities apparently is intent upon going from bad to worse.

We quote from the record:

"Congressman JOE STARNES, of Alabama (a member of the committee). Christopher Marlowe. Isn't Christopher Marlowe a Communist?"

"Mrs. HALLIE FLANAGAN (director of W. P. A. Federal Theater projects). I want it put into the record that Christopher Marlowe was a noted playwright in the days of Shakespeare."

In other words, Congressman STARNES apparently was more determined to see red—whether it was there or not—than he was to learn whether real Communists were boring from within the Federal theater.

As to the matter of Jimmy Roosevelt's church contributions, we think that was a new record low for any congressional investigation. Says Raymond Clapper in his Washington column:

"In 20 years of Washington reporting I have seen a vast quantity of smearing done before congressional investigating committees, but none that outdoes this job. And so far as the published accountants indicate, no member of the Dies committee raised one word of protest against this smear, which in addition to everything else that could be said against it, apparently did young Jimmy Roosevelt the additional injustice of being based on an assumption exactly contrary to the real fact."

The main trouble with the Dies committee, we think, is that it never has been able to keep its eyes on the ball.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) News of December 7, 1938]  
A MINISTER OFFSIDE

For tops in bad taste and something more we herewith nominate the Rev. Howard Stone Anderson, pastor of the First Congregational Church of Washington. The gentleman is the same who yesterday lamented that in son Jimmy Roosevelt's income-tax returns he was unable to find any contributions to churches among the infinitesimal charities son Jimmy had listed.

Son Jimmy says that, in fact, he had contributed to churches but simply hadn't put the contributions down. But what if he hadn't? This is supposed to be a free country in which every man is at liberty to follow the dictates of his own conscience—about contributing to churches, as well as belonging to them, among other things. You may believe that it is the moral duty of all men to contribute to churches, but that is only what you believe, and you have no right at all to attempt to force that belief on other men. Nor does the fact that a man happens to be the son of the President of the United States deprive him of the privilege of giving as he pleases or doesn't please.

Like son Jimmy or dislike him—and he is not one of our favorites—he must be conceded equal rights with the lowliest and most obscure of private citizens. One right fundamental to decency and fair play is the disposal of his own money in whatever way he chooses and without accounting to ministers or the Dies committee.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Denver, Colo., December 9, 1938]  
BUY HIM A BOOK

Congressman JOE STARNES, of Alabama (a member of the Dies committee). Christopher Marlowe? Isn't Christopher Marlowe a Communist?

Mrs. HALLIE FLANAGAN (director of W. P. A. Federal Theater projects). I want it put into the record that Christopher Marlowe was a noted playwright of the days of Shakespeare.

Which recalls the one-time Governor of Oklahoma, Jack Walton, who, incensed because a newspaper editorial about him had quoted Robert Browning's poem, *The Lost Leader*, ordered his henchmen: "Arrest this guy Browning and bring him in. I'll teach him to write poetry about me."

And the lady of literary pretensions who said she considered Scott's Emulsion the best thing he ever wrote.

Congressman STARNES has unwittingly revealed one of the reasons why the Dies committee has fumbled so many of its opportunities.

The W. P. A. theater projects were started on the theory that unemployed actors, like unemployed carpenters, should have a chance to keep on with the kind of work for which they are best fitted. We think it's unquestionably true that the projects have employed a good many people who never did and never can earn their living as professional actors. And many of its plays have seemed to promote some pretty strange and startling doctrines, social, economic, and political.

The Dies investigation might have shed valuable light on the extent to which real Communists have bored from within the Federal theater, using the taxpayers' money to propagandize for un-American principles.

But Congressman STARNES evidently determining to see red whether it's there or not, has turned that phase of the inquiry into a farce by asking one question.

[From the Decatur (Ill.) Herald of November 24, 1938]  
SLANDER

About the most outrageous libel yet perpetrated by the congressional investigating committee headed by reactionary MARTIN DIES is that one in which Secretary Harold Ickes is called a Communist because he is alleged to have given support to the American Civil Liberties Union.

The witness brought before the committee could testify only to a suspicion that Mr. Ickes is now or ever has been a member of the Civil Liberties Union. No matter; the unsupported statement of one man, reputation and character unknown, is used by Congressman DIES to put headlines in newspapers the country over linking the Secretary's name with Communist doctrine. The truth is tardy in catching up with insinuations of this sort.

But supposing it should be shown that Mr. Ickes actually was a member, or contributor to the Civil Liberties Union—what then? Would that prove him a Communist, or a person of Communist sympathies?

The answer is that, if it is communistic to support the Civil Liberties Union, then it is communistic to support the Constitution of the United States. That is all the Civil Liberties Union ever has attempted to do. Composed of high-minded lawyers, educators, and other patriots, this organization has assumed that the individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution mean what they say. When Tom Girdler, millionaire president of a steel company, wants to use his right of free speech to denounce the Government, and when a radical labor organizer wants to use the constitutional right of free speech to denounce the Government, the Civil Liberties Union holds that both are entitled to speak without interference. That is Americanism, if Americanism can be defined by any of the official documents on which this country was built.

If Mr. Ickes is not a member of the Civil Liberties Union, it is regrettable, as every real believer in the democratic system of government who can afford it ought to be.

[From the Charlotte (N. C.) News of November 23, 1938]  
SPOTTING TREASON

Yesterday appeared before the Dies committee Alice Lee Jemison. Alice Lee is a Yosemite Indian, and she holds a nice job as Washington lobbyist for an organization calling itself the American Indian Federation. And what Alice Lee had to tell was terrific—simply terrific. And sinister—my, my, you have no idea how sinister. Alice Lee had the lowdown on Harold Ickes, Indian Commissioner John Collier—yea, and on Congress itself.

What Alice Lee told Mr. DIES, that great defender of the Republic, was that, to her knowledge, Ickes and Collier have actually expressed a belief in the principles of the American Civil Liberties Union. And Congress—believe it or not, Congress has actually passed some laws recommended by the Civil Liberties Union.

Ourselves, we are simply appalled at the shocking news. This Civil Liberties Union, we knew all along, has some "reds" and a good many more "pinks" on its committee, but we had sort of excused it on the score that it had more liberals. But now we

look it up, and what do you think are its principles? Why, the defense of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States. The defense of the right of free speech and assembly for all comers, precisely as that Bill of Rights provides. Think of Ickes and Collier actually confessing to belief in such principles. Think of Congress daring to be so un-American as to enact laws in defense of such basic American rights. Alice Lee and Mr. DIES—let us never overlook Mr. DIES—deserve a roar of thanks for having unearthed such nefarious doings in high places.

[From the Kansas City Journal of November 30, 1938]

#### ANOTHER DUD

Chairman DIES, of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, urges the State Department to invoke against certain Communist and Nazi organizations a law requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals. No doubt the registration of those whose activity comes within the meaning of the law is desirable. It would, for one thing, discourage the noisy investigation of their activities by congressional committees whose members are not averse to occasional stump speeches on their own account. Disregarding that for the moment, it is enlightening to investigate the origin of the law which Mr. DIES would invoke.

It is the one and only result of a similar "sensational" investigation by a congressional committee in 1934. The Fish committee of 8 years ago made an even worse showing. Of its 14 recommendations made to Congress, none was enacted. If the Dies committee lives up to the average, it would, after its tumult and shouting, cause the enactment of one-half of a law. And that fraction, if the average still held, would be of dubious value.

Congressional investigators have a habit of straying afield and becoming embroiled in domestic politics. Mr. DIES is an anti-New Dealer. His committee's principal concern has not been the infiltration of Nazi and Communist doctrines, but in a ridiculous attempt to smear the national administration. National "menaces" take form as they are dreamed by committee chairmen, who also are authors of the resolutions authorizing the investigations.

The Dies committee will adjourn without having made a substantial contribution to the Nation's understanding of threatening menaces from abroad. It leaves only the echo of acrimonious partisanship, providing additional evidence that illegal activity by Hitlerites and Bolsheviks lies properly in the sphere of the Justice Department.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield all the remaining time, with the exception of one-half minute, to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I understand there are 3 minutes remaining on this side. I am glad to yield that time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the fact that the gentleman has 3 minutes remaining and he has not yielded any of his time to anyone opposed to the resolution, would he not yield 2 of the 3 remaining minutes to me?

Mr. MAPES. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that I have endeavored to take care of the time on this side for those who desired to speak on this side, as is the custom, and I have agreed to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas; otherwise I would be able to accommodate the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this campaign of abuse and misrepresentation is no new thing. I hold in my hand a pamphlet which was issued and distributed shortly after this committee began its investigation, in which a number of Members of Congress, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK], Miss Frances Perkins, and Harold L. Ickes, and others, attacked this committee. From the beginning there was a well-organized attempt to discredit this committee by misrepresentation and by ridicule. Before the committee ever began its work we invited John L. Lewis to appear before us and give us the benefit of any information or facts that he might have. He did not see fit to accept this invitation. Then, when the Non-Partisan League attacked us, the chairman of the committee wrote to the league and challenged them to appear before the committee and deny under oath, if they could do so, the charges that had been made. We repeatedly extended invitations to those individuals and organizations which were involved in any charge

to appear before the committee and answer the charge. In spite of the invitations, those individuals and organizations did not appear, but resorted to their agreed strategy of ridicule and misrepresentation.

The charge has been made that it was the concerted effort of this committee to smear the New Deal. I challenge any Member of this House to read the report and to read the respectful, polite letters which we wrote to the heads of departments, in pursuance to the request of the House, contained in the resolution; letters in which we were carrying out your mandate when we requested the heads of the departments to supply us with adequate aid; and then I challenge any Member to read the replies, consider the long delays and the attitude of contempt. Could we have intended or could it have been the design of the committee to smear the administration when we were begging the heads of the departments, New Dealers like Cummings and Hopkins, to furnish us with the investigators and the attorneys to do the investigating?

Yet, in spite of these facts, in spite of the record, those Members who appeared before the Rules Committee during the past 3 days saw fit to resort to personal abuse and vilification.

Let me say to the House that while this committee undoubtedly made some mistakes, yet I am reminded of the fact that another body gave another committee \$155,000 and that the departments of this Government supplied that committee with numerous investigators, attorneys, and assistants. In spite of all the aid that the other committee received, they placed on the stand certain well-known Communists to attack American businessmen. [Applause.] I make this statement not to charge that that committee did it intentionally, but to illustrate the fact that a committee furnished with all the aid they needed nevertheless did make mistakes. You did not, however, hear the outcry, such as has come from certain sections and from certain people in this country against our committee. Why?

Let me make this further remark, that no chairman, and no committee can conduct a fair, a fearless, and an honest investigation without arousing and incurring the enmity and the hatred and the bitterness of those whom it investigates.

Mr. Speaker, this committee with inadequate funds, struggling under great handicaps, harassed and molested, and yet doing everything in its power to render a patriotic service to this country—in spite of all this, nevertheless gave to the Nation a unanimous report, a report based upon facts and not upon opinions or hearsay.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. No; my time is too limited.

Mr. Speaker, if this investigation is continued this committee is going to recognize such mistakes as were made, and is going to do everything within its power to continue a fearless, an honest, and a sincere investigation of what is a definite danger to the stability and the life of America. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. In view of the gentleman's statement, will not the gentleman start an investigation of propaganda such as we see in the morning's paper, "Nazis call F. D. Bolshevik"? We know that is a lie.

Mr. DIES. This committee spent a large part of its funds investigating Nazi and Fascist activities in this country. We sent an investigator all over the United States, and during the last days, when our money was being rapidly exhausted, nevertheless, we investigated numerous so-called Nazi and Fascist organizations. In spite of bona fide and honest efforts to investigate nazi-ism, nevertheless, those who are opposed to an investigation of communism began to disseminate propaganda all over this country that the committee was sympathetic with the Nazis, sympathetic with the Fascists. Why did they do this? What is there about this thing that brings about such a hue and cry? We Democrats do not fear an



honest and fearless exposure of communism. Everybody knows the Democratic Party is not in sympathy with communism. The Democrats of this Nation are Americans. [Applause.] And I resent this misrepresentation; I resent it; I resent it.

I did not attack a Cabinet officer until certain Cabinet officers went out of their way to attack an independent agency of this Congress. I love this Congress. My father served in this House for 10 years. [Applause.] And during all the time he was here he defended the integrity, the dignity, and the prerogatives of this House. When, therefore, Cabinet officers—appointive officials of the Government—went out of their way not merely to attack me, for I am merely an humble and insignificant member of a great body—when they attacked this committee they attacked the greatest deliberative body on earth, and I resented such action. [Applause.] I say this in justification.

May I also express my deep gratitude to the members of this committee for their loyalty and their courage. There was a time when our backs were against the wall, when radical writers were trying to besmear us with deliberate lies and misrepresentation. There was a time when powerful forces were turned loose for the deliberate purpose of destroying an investigation that was honestly and sincerely undertaking to do a patriotic service to the people of this country. Let me say further that the real liberals have nothing to fear from an honest investigation, for true liberals are as much opposed to communism as are the conservatives.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. DIES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I am glad to note that the gentleman says he will rectify some of the errors. Will he retain skillful and adroit counsel and will he follow counsel's advice to sift facts from fiction?

Mr. DIES. The chairman of this committee will do what he did before, everything in his power to render an honest and patriotic service. [Applause.]

Let me say this to the gentleman and let me say it to other Members of this House, that no one can deny that the intolerant ideologies of Europe have been transplanted to our shores. The quarrels and the feuds of the Old World have been transferred to America. No one can deny that insidious forces are seeking to change the structure of this Government by intrigue and by violence. Yet I hear Members of Congress accuse me of seeking to hurt my administration, or to hurt my party.

I am thinking of one whose memory will ever dwell in my heart and for whom I entertained profound love and devotion. He left me as a priceless heritage a record in this House which was distinguished by courage and patriotism. No man loved the Democratic Party more than he did. And yet at a moment of crisis he did not hesitate to place his country above partisanship. I would be unworthy of him and the heritage of unselfish service which he left me if I did not place the interest of our beloved country above what some misguided partisans conceive to be the interest of the party.

As a matter of fact, this is not a partisan question. Here we are dealing with the life of America, with the fundamentals, with that concerning which all men of all parties, of all races, and of all creeds can unite in a common defense.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman has not answered the question. Will the gentleman hire a lawyer to help him?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. If, as a matter of fact, there is anything wrong within the councils of the Government of the United States and the Democratic Party is in charge of the Government, is it not the duty of our party to see that it comes out, and is that not the only purpose of this committee?

Mr. DIES. I would rather the Democrats take the initiative and show courage than to leave it to some other party to do.

Mr. Speaker, can it be said that we have erred in exposing men prominent in this Government who by their own ad-

missions subscribe to communism? Can it be said that we erred in going into certain labor unions and showing by uncontradicted evidence, by the testimony of officials and members of the union itself, that here were Communists who had infiltrated the legitimate labor unions, had seized strategic positions, and were converting those labor unions into instrumentalities of class warfare? Were we being partisan when we gave to the American people facts with respect to those matters? Were we being partisan when we exposed one situation in the city of New York on the Federal Writers project whereby, through their own admission, 103 out of 300 employees being supported by the money of loyal American citizens, were members of the Communist Party?

Mr. Speaker, I submit that America comes before all questions of partisanship. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "1941" and insert in lieu thereof "1940."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON, Mr. MARCANTONIO, and Mr. DUNN) there were—ayes 320, noes 27.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 344, nays 35, answered "present" 2, not voting 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—344

Alexander	Claypool	Fenton	Hoffman
Allen, Ill.	Clevenger	Ferguson	Holmes
Allen, La.	Cluett	Fernandez	Hope
Allen, Pa.	Cochran	Fish	Horton
Andersen, H. Carl	Coffee, Nebr.	Fitzpatrick	Houston
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, Md.	Flaherty	Hull
Anderson, Mo.	Cole, N. Y.	Flannagan	Jacobsen
Andresen, A. H.	Colmer	Flannery	Jarman
Andrews	Connery	Folger	Jarrett
Arends	Cooley	Ford, Leland M.	Jenkins, Ohio
Arnold	Cooper	Ford, Miss.	Jenks, N. H.
Austin	Corbett	Fulmer	Jensen
Ball	Costello	Gamble	Johns
Barnes	Cox	Garrett	Johnson, Ill.
Barry	Crawford	Gartner	Johnson, Luther A.
Barton	Crowe	Gathings	Johnson, Lyndon
Bates, Ky.	Crowther	Gavagan	Johnson, Okla.
Bates, Mass.	Culkin	Gearhart	Johnson, W. Va.
Beam	Cullen	Gehrmann	Jones, Ohio
Beckworth	Cummings	Gerlach	Jones, Tex.
Blackney	Curtis	Gibbs	Kean
Bland	D'Alesandro	Gifford	Kee
Bloom	Darden	Gilchrist	Keefe
Boehne	Darrow	Gillie	Kelly
Bolles	Delaney	Goldsbrough	Kennedy, Martin
Boren	Dempsey	Gore	Kennedy, Michael
Bradley, Mich.	DeRouen	Gossett	Kennedy, Md.
Brewster	Dies	Graham	Keogh
Brooks	Dingell	Grant, Ala.	Kerr
Brown, Ga.	Dirksen	Grant, Ind.	Kilday
Brown, Ohio	Disney	Griffith	Kinzer
Bryson	Ditter	Griswold	Kitchens
Buck	Doughton	Gross	Kleberg
Buckley, N. Y.	Douglas	Guyer, Kans.	Knutson
Bulwinkle	Dowell	Gwynne	Kocalkowski
Burch	Doxey	Hall	Kramer
Burdick	Duncan	Halleck	Kunkel
Burgin	Durham	Hancock	Lambertson
Byrns, Tenn.	Dworshak	Hare	Landis
Cannon, Fla.	Eaton, Calif.	Harness	Lanham
Cannon, Mo.	Eaton, N. J.	Hart	Lea
Carlson	Eberharter	Harter, Ohio	LeCompte
Cartwright	Edmiston	Hartley	Lemke
Case, S. Dak.	Elliott	Hawks	Lesinski
Celler	Ellis	Healey	Lewis, Colo.
Chandler	Elston	Heinke	Lewis, Ohio
Chapman	Engel	Hendricks	Lord
Chiferfield	Englebright	Hennings	Luce
Church	Evans	Hess	Ludlow
Clark	Faddis	Hinshaw	McAndrews
Clason	Fay	Hobbs	McArdle

McCormack	Oliver	Rutherford	Thill
McDowell	O'Neal	Ryan	Thomas, N. J.
McGehee	Osmers	Sandager	Thomas, Tex.
McLaughlin	O'Toole	Schaefer, Ill.	Thomason
McLeod	Owen	Schafer, Wis.	Thorkelson
McMillan, John L.	Patman	Schiffler	Tibbott
McMillan, Thos. S.	Maas	Schuetz	Tinkham
Maas	Patrick	Schwert	Tolan
Mahon	Patton	Secombe	Treadway
Maloney	Pearson	Secrest	Turner
Mapes	Peterson, Fla.	Shafer, Mich.	Van Zandt
Marshall	Peterson, Ga.	Short	Vinson, Ga.
Martin, Iowa	Pfeifer	Simpson	Vorys, Ohio
Martin, Mass.	Pierce, N. Y.	Smith, Conn.	Vreeland
Mason	Pittenger	Smith, Maine	Wadsworth
Massingale	Plumley	Smith, Ohio	Walton
May	Poage	Smith Va.	Warren
Merritt	Polk	Smith, Wash.	Weaver
Michener	Powers	South	Welch
Miller	Rabaut	Sparkman	West
Mills, Ark.	Ramspeck	Spence	Wheat
Mills, La.	Randolph	Springer	Whelchel
Monkiewicz	Reece, Tenn.	Starnes, Ala.	White, Idaho
Monroney	Reed, Ill.	Steagall	White, Ohio
Moser	Reed, N. Y.	Stearns, N. H.	Whittington
Mott	Rees, Kans.	Stefan	Williams, Mo.
Mouton	Rich	Sumner, Ill.	Winter
Mundt	Richards	Summers, Tex.	Wolcott
Murray	Robertson	Sutphin	Wolfenden, Pa.
Nelson	Robison, Ky.	Taber	Wolverton, N. J.
Nichols	Rockefeller	Talle	Wood
Norrell	Rogers, Mass.	Tarver	Woodruff, Mich.
Norton	Rogers, Okla.	Taylor, Colo.	Woodrum, Va.
O'Brien	Romjue	Taylor, Tenn.	Youngdahl
O'Leary	Routzohn	Terry	Zimmerman

## NAYS—35

Boland	Havener	Mitchell	Scrugham
Bradley, Pa.	Hill	Murdock, Utah	Shanley
Byron	Izac	Myers	Shannon
Casey, Mass.	Keller	O'Connor	Sirovich
Coffee, Wash.	Larrabee	O'Day	Tenerowicz
Dunn	McGranery	Robinson, Utah	Vincent, Ky.
Ford, Thomas F.	McKeough	Sabath	Voorhis, Calif.
Fries	Marcantonio	Sacks	Wallgren
Geyer, Calif.	Martin, Colo.	Schulte	

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Hook	Magnuson
------	----------

## NOT VOTING—51

Angell	Crosser	Kirwan	Rodgers, Pa.
Ashbrook	Curley	Leavy	Satterfield
Barden	Daly	McLean	Seger
Bell	Dickstein	McReynolds	Sheppard
Bender	Dondero	Maclejewski	Smith, Ill.
Bolton	Drewry	Mansfield	Smith, W. Va.
Boykin	Green	Martin, Ill.	Snyder
Buckler, Minn.	Gregory	Murdock, Ariz.	Somers, N. Y.
Byrne, N. Y.	Harrington	Parsons	Sullivan
Caldwell	Harter, N. Y.	Pierce, Oreg.	Sweeney
Carter	Hunter	Rankin	Wigglesworth
Collins	Jeffries	Rayburn	Williams, Del.
Creal	Johnson, Ind.	Risk	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:  
General pairs:

Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Seger.  
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. McLean.  
Mr. Rankin with Mr. Bolton.  
Mr. Bell with Mr. Dondero.  
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Risk.  
Mr. Gregory with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.  
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Harter of New York.  
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Wigglesworth.  
Mr. McReynolds with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.  
Mr. Collins with Mr. Williams of Delaware.  
Mr. Barden with Mr. Bender.  
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Jeffries.  
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Angell.  
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.  
Mr. Caldwell with Mr. Daly.  
Mr. Leavy with Mr. Pierce of Oregon.  
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Kirwan.  
Mr. Creal with Mr. Snyder.  
Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Parsons.  
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Hunter.  
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Sheppard.  
Mr. Curley with Mr. Smith of Illinois.  
Mr. Martin of Illinois with Mr. Green.  
Mr. Murdock of Arizona with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey is not recorded.

Mrs. NORTON. I desire to vote, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I was not in the House when my name was called. I was called out.

The SPEAKER. Under the circumstances stated by the gentlewoman from New Jersey, unless she was in Hall of the House and listening and failed to hear her name called, she does not qualify.

Mrs. NORTON. I was in the Hall of the House but was called out and came back, and my name had been called.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentlewoman present when her name was called?

Mrs. NORTON. No; I was not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman does not qualify under the rule.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in this chair while the gentlewoman was sitting there, and she did not hear her name called. I was right alongside of her.

Mrs. NORTON. I did not hear my name called, but I was in the House.

The SPEAKER. If the gentlewoman was in the House and failed to hear her name called—

Mrs. NORTON. I was. I was sitting here most of the time, but whether or not I was here when my name was called I am not sure.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will again submit to the gentlewoman from New Jersey the inquiry which is the universal rule for qualifying. Was the gentlewoman in the Hall of the House and listening and failed to hear her name?

Mrs. NORTON. I was in the House. I did not hear my name called. I was in the House part of the time, Mr. Speaker, but I was not in the House all the time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Was the gentlewoman in the Hall of the House and listening and failed to hear her name? That is the universal qualification.

Mrs. NORTON. Everybody here seems to think that.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman was sitting right here. She was in the House when her name was called and did not hear it.

Mrs. NORTON. Do I qualify, Mr. Speaker? If I do qualify, I will vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman qualifies and votes "yea."

Let there be no misunderstanding. The Chair repeatedly inquired of the gentlewoman from New Jersey, and the Chair understood the gentlewoman to say it was her best judgment that she was in the Hall listening and failed to hear her name.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member would like to see the gentlewoman vote, but a very vital question is involved in respect of the precedents of the House. My understanding is that in order to qualify, a Member must answer affirmatively that the Member was in the Hall and failed to hear his name called; and to say that is true to his best judgment does not meet the test.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia did not fully state the qualifications. The Member must also be listening and fail to hear his name called.

In order that there may be no confusion, and in order to preserve the precedents of the House, the Chair submits to the gentlewoman the inquiry, Does she qualify under the rule just stated?

Mrs. NORTON. I believe I do qualify, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot question the statement of the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mr. MAPES. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAPES. I do this merely for the purpose of getting a chance to make an observation as to a phrase I believe the Speaker overlooked in his statement. It is not "Was the Member in the House listening?" but "Was the Member in the House listening when his name was called?"

The SPEAKER. The Chair will accept the statement of the gentlewoman from New Jersey.



Mr. MAPES. I have the same feeling as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum]. I should be glad to have the gentlewoman from New Jersey vote, but it is a matter of establishing a precedent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia very correctly stated the rule. The gentlewoman from New Jersey, as the Chair understands, states as a Member that she believes and, as the Chair construes it, that it is her best recollection and judgment that she does qualify.

How does the gentlewoman vote?

Mrs. NORTON. I vote "yea," Mr. Speaker.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I desire to state that my colleague, Mr. SATTERFIELD, is detained at home by illness in his family. If he had been present, he would have voted "yea" on the resolution just passed.

I wish also to say that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY] was unavoidably detained and would have voted "yea."

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a brief article by Mr. David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF VOTE

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, Messrs. SEGER, RODGERS of Pennsylvania, RISK, McLEAN, JOHNSON of Indiana, WIGGLESWORTH, ANGELL, WILLIAMS of Delaware, BENDER, CARTER, BOLTON, DONDERO, HARTER of New York, and JEFFRIES, were unavoidably absent either through illness or on account of Government business. Had they been present, they would have voted "yea" on the Dies resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] is unavoidably detained because of illness, thereby depriving him of his right to vote on the Dies resolution.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein telegrams between myself and a former Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable John J. Cornwell, on my stand on the continuation of the Dies committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] what length of time was given under his request with respect to extension of remarks on the Dies resolution?

Mr. COX. Five legislative days.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a few telegrams and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Springfield Daily News headed "False and Silly, Says Congressman CASEY."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address by Hon. Sumner Welles, the Under Secretary of State. Today I have received word from the Public Printer that the speech will cover two and a half pages of the RECORD, or one-half page over the limit. I therefore renew my request to insert the speech in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted at the national convention of the United Spanish War Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in revising the remarks I made on the floor today I may include a few brief editorials relating to the subject matter.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, are these editorials of any considerable length?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I had unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a certain article in the RECORD. I am now advised by the Public Printer that the article will take about four pages, and I therefore renew my unanimous-consent request to include the article in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution passed by the Legislature of the great State of Wyoming.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

#### FOREIGN TRADE—THE ROAD TO PEACE AND PROSPERITY

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, in his recent Jackson Day speech, the President described some of his Republican critics as "straddlebugs." Just who he had in mind I do not

undertake to say, but when a Republican Member of this House places one foot on a sound fiscal policy and the other on the Pelion of a \$4,000,000,000 old-age pension scheme, he is making a right wide stretch. And when a Republican of this House advocates a restoration of foreign trade and at the same time condemns our reciprocal-trade agreement program, the stretch at the moment may not be so apparent, but the inconsistency is just as deep and significant.

#### A NONPARTISAN PROGRAM

For a long time American leaders of political thought, regardless of party affiliation, have frankly admitted that we cannot hope to sell abroad unless we are willing to buy from abroad. That principle was aptly stated just a few days ago by the Republican nominee for Vice President in 1936, Col. Frank Knox, of Chicago, who said:

To sell American farm products abroad, we must buy some of what our foreign customers have to sell. You cannot always sell and never buy in foreign trades.

And he added:

To attempt to help the farmer by promising him higher and higher tariffs on his products is naught but a red herring drawn across the trail to divert him from attack on the excessively high tariff rates on domestic manufactures. It is time that the farmer recognizes this for what it is.

The position on this important issue, which is fundamentally an economic and not a political, partisan issue, thus taken by Colonel Knox is supported by public opinion as indicated by recent polls of the Institute of Public Opinion. The proposal to negotiate a trade agreement with Great Britain was, by a Gallup poll conducted in March 1938, supported by 79 percent of the Democrats and 61 percent of the Republicans. The second question, dealing with a reduction in our tariffs in return for reductions in British rates, was favored by 76 percent of the Democrats and 66 percent of the Republicans. A September poll conducted by Who's Who indicated that 86 percent of those who answered favored a trade agreement with the United Kingdom. An institute poll conducted last December, on the eve of the Lima Conference, indicated that 8 out of every 10 voters who had formed an opinion about the work of the Secretary of State favored his efforts to break down tariff barriers to international trade.

Trade reciprocity has been supported by a long line of distinguished Republicans as well as Democrats, dating primarily from the famous Buffalo speech of President McKinley, when he said:

The period of exclusiveness is past. Commercial wars are unprofitable; reciprocity treaties are in harmony with the spirit of the times; measures of retaliation are not.

That speech was delivered by the illustrious McKinley shortly after his embarrassing experience of having a Republican Senate refuse to ratify a series of reciprocal-trade agreements which he had tediously and conscientiously negotiated. Yet, with full knowledge of the lobbying power of tariff-protected interests—which reached its highest and most disgusting fruition in 1930 when Grundy was able to have his name linked with Hawley and Smoot as patrons of the bill—there are those today who insist that no trade agreement shall become effective until ratified by the Senate. That suggestion comes from no true friend of the expansion of our foreign trade but rather from those who are either opposed to the program in toto or else opposed to the program as it affects some particular interest.

It may interest some of my Republican colleagues who have not followed Al Smith's injunction to "take a look at the record" to know that McKinley's stand on reciprocity has subsequently been supported by such Republican leaders as former Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson; Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes; the former Ambassador to Chile, Hon. William S. Culbertson, whose book on the subject is the best that has ever been published; former Chairman of the Tariff Commission Robert L. O'Brien; the great statistician, Roger W. Babson; the former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Harper Sibley; the beloved editor, William Allen White; and the outstanding educator,

Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler. Many prominent Republican bankers are to be found—James P. Warburg and Winthrop W. Aldrich, the latter the son of one tariff maker and the brother of another. We find the program supported by such industrial leaders as Alfred P. Sloan, of General Motors; James Ford Bell, of General Mills; Elliott Wadsworth, who, in addition to being interested in New England manufacturing, is president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

If time permitted, I could name many more leading Republicans in support of my contention that a partisan, isolationist tariff policy died with what William Allen White aptly described as the "golden era of dollar diplomacy." When as a nation we embarked upon the dangerous and turbulent sea of imperialism, we conceived the fallacious and erroneous idea that we could become rich and a dominant power in world trade by selling to the other nations of the world and refusing to them the right to sell to us.

#### ATTITUDE OF THE PRESS

If I had time, I could quote leading editorials from such papers as the Berkshire Eagle, the Boston Herald, the Springfield Republican, the Hartford Courant, the Kansas City Star, the Washington Post, the Herald Tribune, the Terre Haute Star, the Oregon Journal, the Philadelphia Bulletin, and so forth, the consensus of whose opinion was thus expressed by the Boston Herald on November 18 last, when it said:

The most intelligent of New England Republicans and Democrats have approved of the underlying principles of the Hull program. They have become impatient at subsidies, restrictions, quotas, discriminations, high duties, and other brakes on the free movement of international trade. The fear locally has been that our own industries would not be safeguarded as carefully as the agricultural activities of the Middle West. To date it is a pleasure to say the predictions of disaster have not come true. We have not been penalized. Even our boot and shoe industry, which seemed to be threatened by the Hull agreement with Czechoslovakia, is still doing very nicely.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. For a very brief question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman spoke awhile ago of Czechoslovakia and its threat to the shoe trade.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That was a quotation from a Boston paper. I merely said what the Boston paper said.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I quote some departmental figures?

Mr. ROBERTSON. In the lady's own time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When the German army of occupation went into Czechoslovakia, of course Czechoslovakia did not send so many shoes to this country.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I quoted from the Boston paper, and if the gentlewoman from Massachusetts wishes later to insert some figures, she, of course, has that privilege.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert some figures at this point, if the gentleman is willing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Oh, not in my speech.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then immediately after the gentleman's speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### A BOOST FOR CORN

Mr. ROBERTSON. As to the reference in that editorial to promoting the interests of the Middle West, I desire to remind my colleagues from that area of the fact that in 1938 exports of corn amounted to 147,505,000 bushels—the highest since 1921. And I cannot picture a single Representative of a commercial corn State that will be subject to the compulsory control, under certain conditions, of the 1938 Farm Act who would not prefer an export market that would justify normal production at a fair price to a compulsory reduction program to accomplish that objective.

#### FACTS TO BE FACED

The fact that I have not spoken often on the floor of the House during the past 6 years should not be taken as an indication of the fact that I have not felt deeply about the



economic problems that confronted us. But there have been times when I frankly did not know what was best to be done, and there have been other times when my views on economic problems have been so wholly at variance with those entertained by a majority of this House that to have publicly urged my views upon such a majority would have been an act of futility.

Out of the experimental program of the past 6 years, and we must frankly admit that much of it was experimental, certain fundamental facts are gradually emerging which should be realistically faced. One of those facts is that as long as we have a serious unemployment problem, so long will we resort to deficit financing as a means of meeting it. Equally as clear, I think, is the fact that if we continue deficit financing long enough we will wind up in bankruptcy. My primary purpose in imposing today upon your time and patience is to endorse a chart for our ship of state that will steer clear of that rock. I have served long enough with the minority Members of this House who have been here with me since the Seventy-third Congress to fully appreciate their ability, their high-mindedness, and their patriotism, and no one would repudiate more quickly or more indignantly than I any suggestion that the Republican Members of this House would be a party to any program to sink our country—their country as well as mine—for a temporary political advantage.

#### A PLEA TO BUSINESS

And so, in a spirit of "sweet reasonableness," eliminating, I hope, all sectionalism and all thought of the fact that I am a "bred in the bone" Democrat, I will undertake to present to those who are either opposed to the reciprocal-trade-agreement program or skeptical of its benefits my firm belief

that the possibility of currency inflation is a threat to the perpetuity of representative democracy; that the best way to safeguard against currency inflation is the reemployment in private industry of those now on the relief rolls; and that the most practical way to bring about reemployment in private industry is for business men to courageously put idle funds to work in expanding both their domestic and foreign markets, supporting reciprocal-trade agreements as the best medium for expanding export trade.

And I make this plea for trade agreements not only to my colleagues in the House but to all of the businessmen of the Nation, both big and little, who have so frequently said during recent years that the trouble with business is lack of confidence. Currency inflation will ruin them financially, as well as it will ruin us politically, and currency inflation, as I now view the political and economic situation, is the only real fear at the root of the present psychology of timidity. There may be a few business leaders who think that the "golden era of dollar diplomacy" is not dead and buried; a few who may think that if they can bring about the downfall of the Democratic Party in 1940 the Republican Party would promptly wipe from the statute books all of the reforms of the past 6 years. If there be any such, they are engaging in pipe dreams and suffering from a sad delusion. In my opinion, the rank and file of businessmen, whether big or little businessmen, subscribe to Lincoln's theory that "trade knows no politics." Naturally, they want to save themselves from disaster and, of course, in saving themselves they will also save the country.

#### RELATION OF FOREIGN TRADE TO NATIONAL INCOME

I, therefore, offer for their consideration the following statistical table:

Calendar year	Bank deposits as of June 30 <sup>1</sup>	Currency in circulation as of June 30 <sup>1</sup>	Velocity of bank deposits, corrected for seasonal variation <sup>2</sup> (annual rate of turn-over)		Total non-agricultural employment in United States <sup>4</sup> (monthly average)	Combined index of industrial production <sup>5</sup> (1923-25=100)	United States foreign trade, merchandise <sup>6</sup>		National income paid out <sup>7</sup>
			100 leading cities, excluding New York City	New York City			Exports, including reexports	General imports	
1929	\$57,910,641,000	\$4,746,297,000	47.2	132.4	36,141,000	119	\$5,240,995,000	\$4,399,361,000	\$78,556,000,000
1930	59,847,195,000	4,521,988,000	40.0	83.2	33,925,000	96	3,843,181,000	3,060,908,000	73,290,000,000
1931	56,864,744,000	4,821,933,000	32.9	56.8	30,870,000	81	2,424,289,000	2,090,635,000	62,032,000,000
1932	45,390,269,000	5,695,171,000	28.4	41.5	27,661,000	64	1,611,016,000	1,322,774,000	49,024,000,000
1933	41,533,470,000	5,720,764,000	28.0	38.9	27,726,000	76	1,674,994,000	1,449,559,000	45,317,000,000
1934	46,625,041,000	5,373,470,000	26.8	36.7	30,259,000	79	2,132,800,000	1,655,055,000	51,510,000,000
1935	51,586,123,000	5,567,093,000	26.3	34.4	31,482,000	90	2,282,874,000	2,047,485,000	55,137,000,000
1936	58,339,815,000	6,241,200,000	26.4	33.8	33,201,000	105	2,455,978,000	2,422,592,000	62,586,000,000
1937	59,822,370,000	6,447,056,000	26.5	32.0	34,557,000	110	3,349,167,000	3,083,668,000	69,336,000,000
1938	59,379,550,000	6,460,891,000			32,132,000	84	3,094,095,000	1,900,528,000	66,000,000,000
January			24.7	29.0			289,063,000	170,689,000	
February			23.3	24.9			261,927,000	162,955,000	
March			23.5	26.2			275,302,000	173,360,000	
April			23.1	27.5			274,467,000	159,827,000	
May			23.2	26.1			257,175,000	148,248,000	
June			22.7	28.8			232,722,000	145,869,000	
July			22.0	27.6			227,521,000	140,820,000	
August			22.3	25.1			230,797,000	165,620,000	
September			22.9	25.8			246,329,000	167,597,000	
October			23.3	27.4			277,919,000	177,979,000	
November			24.5	24.7			252,231,000	176,181,000	

<sup>1</sup> Seventy-fifth Annual Report, Comptroller of the Currency, 1937, p. 766, 1929-37; for 1938 from release by Acting Comptroller of the Currency, of Oct. 26, 1938.

<sup>2</sup> Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury, fiscal year ended June 30, 1938, p. 541.

<sup>3</sup> Based on relation of debits to individual accounts to net demand deposits. Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Data as published by Standard Statistics Co. in Standard Trade and Securities, Banking and Finance, vol. 87, No. 6, p. A-18, 1929-37; for 1938 from Current Statistics, January 1939, vol. 91, No. 6, p. 5. Reliable statistics on the velocity of circulation of coin and currency not available.

<sup>4</sup> Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor. These figures not available in published form.

<sup>5</sup> Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Data as published by U. S. Department of Commerce in Survey of Current Business, 1938, Supp. p. 7; for 1938, January 1939, p. 19.

<sup>6</sup> U. S. Department of Commerce, Monthly Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States, November 1934, p. 3, November 1938, p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> U. S. Department of Commerce, Income in the United States 1929-37, November 1938, table 4.

<sup>8</sup> 11 months' average.

<sup>9</sup> Preliminary, 11 months' average through November.

<sup>10</sup> Estimate in press.

It shows the direct and intimate connection between foreign trade and domestic employment of an industrial character. Incidentally, this table likewise is proof of the fact that business does lack confidence. You will note, for instance, that at the peak of our prosperity in 1929 bank deposits in round figures amounted to \$57,910,000,000, currency in circulation amounted to \$4,746,000,000, and the annual rate of turn-over in the New York City banks was 132.4. In 1938, bank deposits exceeded those of 1929 by approximately a billion and a half dollars, and currency in

circulation exceeded that of 1929 by approximately \$2,000,000,000—the highest in the history of the Nation—yet the annual rate of turn-over in the New York City banks reached the all-time low in November 1938 of 24.7. Money was plentiful; money was cheap, and yet money was idle.

Now, let us examine the figures during the 10-year period from 1929 to 1938 dealing with foreign trade and the national income. In 1929 our exports were \$5,240,995,000, and our imports were \$4,399,361,000, and our national income was at the high of \$78,556,000,000. Now, I frankly ask every

Republican of this House who laid any bricks in the tariff wall of 1930 to look at the figures for foreign trade and national income for 1932, when that isolationist policy had become thoroughly effective, and when we were at the bottom of what most economists frankly admit was largely a man-made depression. Exports had dropped to \$1,611,016,000, imports had dropped to \$1,322,774,000, and the national income had dropped over \$33,000,000,000. And as foreign trade fell off, industrial employment fell off, and, of course, industrial production fell off.

Last October I heard a broadcast from Detroit to the effect that of the 900,000 employable men in Detroit, 300,000 were unemployed. I believe we now have 29,705,220 motor vehicles in use in this country and are exporting about 10 percent of our total production, the production figures for 1937 being 4,808,974, of which 475,914 were exported. Even a greater percentage of production was exported in 1938. Should we lose that foreign market, unemployment in the motor industry will become a permanent as well as a serious problem, unless we are foolish enough to believe that we can have two cars in every garage and no saturation point.

When he was Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, who was made the unwilling and unhappy victim of the high-tariff policies of the Republican leaders of 1930, contended that our foreign trade furnished employment for not less than 2,000,000 workers. The figures in the table before referred to show that with the loss of our foreign trade employment in industry was reduced by nearly a million men, and many other allied workers lost employment through indirect effects.

#### SOME PERTINENT FIGURES

Now, let us see what happened after our great Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, commenced his program in 1934 to break down the trade barriers that had thus hamstrung our prosperity. Each year since the inauguration of that program there has been an increase in our exports, an increase in our imports, an increase in the number of persons employed, an increase in industrial production—except for the temporary recession of 1938—and an increase in our national income. Commencing with the low of exports in 1932 of \$1,611,016,000, they rose in 1938 to \$3,094,095,000, and our imports rose from \$1,322,774,000 to \$1,960,528,000, according to figures recently released by the Department of Commerce and showing a favorable balance of trade of over a billion dollars. Frankly, I am not as much concerned over the amount of our favorable trade balance as I am over the manner in which it is brought about. Much of our 1938 trade balance was settled by imported gold, and we already have more gold than we know what to do with.

#### DOLLAR REVALUATION

I would not be giving you the full picture of what this administration has done to restore foreign trade if I failed to mention the devaluation of the dollar in January 1934. England went off the gold standard in 1931 and the British pound dropped in value until it reached the low of \$3.10. Had the Hoover administration devalued the dollar at the same time that Great Britain went off the gold standard, the curtailment of our export trade would not have been so drastic. When we went off the gold standard the British pound was quoted at about \$3.75, and the currencies of other countries in respect of the dollar were at an even lower ratio.

The future contingency of a marked disparity between our currency and that of Great Britain is covered by article XVIII of the agreement with the United Kingdom, which provides that—

If a wide variation occurs in the rate of exchange between the dollar and the pound sterling which either Government considers so substantial as to prejudice its industries or commerce, it may propose negotiations for the modification of the agreement and, if no agreement can be reached on the proposal, it may terminate the entire agreement on 30 days' notice.

#### EFFECTS OF TRADE AGREEMENTS

Those interested in the subject of tariffs and quotas from an international standpoint would do well to read the chapter on that subject on page 166, et sequitur, of the World Economic Survey for 1937-38 by the Economic Intelligence Service

of the League of Nations. In that report I quote this pertinent sentence:

During recent years, the most important and most effective movement toward the removal of quotas and the reduction of tariffs has been the development of the American policy of negotiating reciprocal-trade agreements based on the most-favored-nation clause . . . The countries with which trade agreements were in operation at the end of 1937 accounted for over a third of the total foreign trade of the United States and, with the conclusion of the new negotiations then announced, nearly 60 percent of the United States foreign trade would be with trade-agreement countries. The trade agreements enabled American exports to trade-agreement countries to expand between 1934-35 and 1936-37 more quickly than her exports to other markets; but during the same period, American imports from trade-agreement countries have increased less rapidly . . .

Time will not permit me to refer to the many editorials and news items from the public press dealing with the marked increase of our foreign trade under the trade-agreement program, but I cannot refrain from mentioning the following headline from the Milwaukee Journal of December 31, 1938:

Export trade assures jobs.

Subheadline:

Milwaukee foreign orders of \$65,000,000 support 36,000 people.

The article in question concludes with this observation:

Exports to these people mean "three square meals a day, a roof over their heads, and a little joy in life."

A Department of Commerce bulletin of August 13, 1938, states that during the calendar year 1937 the value of American exports to agreement countries was 65.6 percent greater than the average of 1934-35, while exports to all nonagreement countries in the same period increased only 44.2 percent. For the 12-month period of 1938 the increase to agreement countries was 66.2 percent against 47.7 percent for nonagreement countries. This trend is illustrated by the following Department of Commerce table:

[Millions of dollars]

	1934 and 1935 (annual average)	Fiscal year 1937-38	Comparison of last 12-month period, ending June 1938, with preagreement period, calendar years 1934 and 1935	
			Value	Percent
United States exports, including re-exports:				
Total, all trade-agreement countries.....	756.8	1,257.7	+500.9	+66.2
Total, all nonagreement countries.....	1,451.0	2,143.4	+692.4	+47.7
Total, all countries.....	2,207.8	3,401.1	+1,192.3	+54.0
United States general imports:				
Total, all trade-agreement countries.....	774.4	977.6	+203.2	+26.2
Total, all nonagreement countries.....	1,077.0	1,383.7	+306.7	+28.5
Total, all countries.....	1,851.4	2,361.3	+509.9	+27.6

The publication, *The Agricultural Situation*, December 1938, page 9, by the Department of Agriculture, stated:

In spite of the distorting effect on trade data produced by drought, fluctuations in industrial activity, and a number of other factors during the past 4 years, available data on foreign trade in agricultural products indicate that trade agreements have substantially benefited American farmers. Agricultural exports to countries with which trade agreements were in effect by 1937 have risen many times more rapidly than those to other countries.

I submit that such evidence is not only the best proof of the actual results of trade agreements but the only evidence that is really pertinent.

The following table constitutes the official record:

*Exports and imports of agricultural products with agreement and nonagreement countries*

	Year ending June 30 1937-38	Increase (+) or decrease (−) 1937-38 over 1935-36	
United States (domestic) exports:	Million dollars	Million dollars	Percent
Farm products:			
To the 16 agreement countries.....	288	+102	+35
To all other countries.....	600	+20	+3
United States imports (for consumption):			
Agricultural commodities:			
From the 16 agreement countries.....	454	−14	−3
From all other countries.....	701	+27	+4



In the quotation above from the Economic Intelligence Service of the League of Nations I hope the words "based on the most-favored-nation clause" did not pass unnoticed because that principle in some Republican quarters has been the recent subject of criticism, but evidently without knowledge of the fact that the most-favored-nation principle had a distinct Republican origin. Again I invite the attention of my Republican friends to William S. Culbertson's book, *Reciprocity*, in which he extols the virtues of the principle and claims for the Republican Party full credit for it. Chief Justice Hughes, when Secretary of State, strongly endorsed the principle, and in a letter to Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, March 13, 1924, said:

As we seek pledges from other foreign countries that they will refrain from practicing discrimination we must be ready to give such pledges, and history has shown that these pledges can be made adequate only in terms of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment. We should seek simplicity and good will as the fundamental conditions of international commerce.

Secretary of Commerce Hoover concurred in the views of Secretary of State Hughes and wrote him on January 3, 1923:

I am inclined to agree with the policy suggested in your letter and would be in favor of confining representations on the part of the United States to a request for most-favored-nation treatment. \* \* \*

Critics of the unconditional most-favored-nation policy apparently fail to understand that we only extend our trade-agreement concessions to other countries in return for valuable concessions. The foreign countries give us similar nondiscriminatory treatment in our trade with them. Furthermore opponents fail to mention that in general the tariff concessions granted in any trade agreement relate to products of which the country in question is the principal or an important source of our total imports of such products, or as under the flexible provisions, the chief competing country. These concessions are generally of secondary interest to third countries. The effects, however, of the extension of the concessions to other countries are taken fully into account in the course of the studies leading up to all concessions.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. The gentleman was speaking about his statement in the publication *The Agricultural Situation*.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. In the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD*, issue of January 23, 1939—in the extension of my own remarks—I inserted two tables quoted from their December 1938 issue, which illustrate the statement which the gentleman made. If the gentleman has not already prepared those figures for his own speech, I wonder if it would not be appropriate to quote them again, because the gentleman's remarks are clearing this situation up very nicely.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the interruption as helpful, but I follow what I have just said with this table of exports and imports of agricultural products with agreement and nonagreement countries.

Mr. BUCK. I think that covers the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That shows that the domestic imports with the 16 agreement countries increased 102 percent. I believe I have the table to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. BUCK. That ought to show that we can certainly develop our foreign export markets through those agreements without sacrificing our domestic economy.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly so, and the burden of my present theme is that unless we trade—and by trading I mean buying as well as selling—we are in for serious domestic trouble that may eventuate in some form of currency inflation which will be ruinous to everyone.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Gladly, to the distinguished chairman of my committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will not the increase in the total national income of the farmer since the reciprocal-trade agreements went into effect over the years prior to that conclusively prove the point the gentleman is making?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The opponents of the program might say that the farmers' best market is the domestic market.

That is true, but you have to have an export market to lift the burden of the surplus production off your domestic market. In other words, a 10-percent surplus may mean a 50-percent reduction in the domestic price, and as the chairman of the committee has pointed out, look at the record of how the national income of the farmers has gone up since we have had these trade agreements, and they cannot say that they have not been helped.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. Let me illustrate with a fact what the gentleman has said. The prune growers of California, Oregon, and Washington, are in a most distressful situation at the present time. The reason is that their crop sales were based on export markets. Germany and Italy were the principal consumers of that commodity. As a result of the foreign situation, the blocking of exchange and various restrictive measures, that export market has been destroyed, and the surplus of prunes forced into our domestic market. That is not the result of any trade-agreement policy, but is entirely the result of the foreign situation, and if we do not recognize the necessity of our foreign market to other crops, the same thing would happen to them, would it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. SHANLEY. The gentleman has given some thought to the necessity of tunneling not only under our own tariffs but the tariffs of retaliatory quotas in foreign nations, which has permitted our manufacturers to put branch manufactories in other countries. Does he believe there is any hope that there is some elimination possible under the reciprocal-trade treaties?

Mr. ROBERTSON. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHANLEY] has made a helpful suggestion. That is not included in my prepared remarks and I am glad to have it. There is no doubt about the fact that when we passed the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act in 1930 we drove industrial plants out of America to foreign countries, where, as the gentleman says, they could tunnel under the tariff and make the finished product of American goods for sale in foreign countries, but with foreign labor and not with American labor.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Is it not a fact that while the Smoot-Hawley bill was in course of preparation more than 1,000 economists throughout the country, Democrats and Republicans, without regard to politics, predicted the very thing would ensue that did ensue if that tariff bill were enacted into law?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have always put the figure at 100 who signed the protest to President Hoover, but I would just as soon put it at 1,000. All the economists there were predicted that.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It was between 1,000 and 1,100, according to my recollection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield for a very brief question.

Mr. CROWTHER. Regarding the status of the farmer under present conditions, I understand from the records that the farmers' income in 1938 was \$1,000,000,000 less than in 1937. We have spent \$3,000,000,000 or more on various types of farm relief. Cotton, corn, wheat are today at new low prices.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agreed to yield for a question and not for a speech.

Mr. CROWTHER. I apologize to the gentleman. He is making a splendid speech. I do not want to inject a sour note into it, especially after it had been so beautifully sweetened by the California prune juice. [Laughter.]

#### AGREEMENTS WITH CANADA AND UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. ROBERTSON. The recent negotiation of an agreement with the United Kingdom and the renewal of the previous agreement with Canada have been a source of particular criticism, but the critics of these agreements have expressed more fears than facts, and when they gave facts they have never given them all. And to me it is quite significant that

the protected interests in Canada that have been adversely affected by the Canadian agreement are now engaged in presenting the identical arguments to the Canadian Parliament that are being presented to the American Congress, namely, that Canada has made a bad deal for Canadians.

In 1937 we exported to Canada \$509,508,000 worth of merchandise and imported from Canada merchandise to the value of \$398,539,000. The present trade between the United States and Canada outranks the trade between any other two countries in the world, and this is as it should be between two nations of such long and deep friendship. In all but 1 of the past 10 years we have been Canada's best customer and have supplied to Canada about three-fifths of her imports. Since the negotiation of a trade agreement with Canada our exports to Canada have increased at the rate of 42 percent above the preagreement period and well above the increase of our exports to the world as a whole. Our imports from Canada have increased in practically the same ratio. In other words, we have engaged in mutually beneficial trade.

Illustrative of how tariffs on certain goods restrict their movement in international trade is the fact that Canada's imports of American products on which duties were substantially reduced increased in 2 years from \$120,000,000 to \$215,000,000, an increase of 80 percent. And the same applied to our importation of Canadian goods, where the increase was 87 percent, as compared with an increase of only 34 percent on dutiable articles not specifically in the agreement and of 35 percent on duty-free goods.

There has been so much misrepresentation regarding the concessions on cattle and dairy products to Canada that I want to summarize exactly what was done in that agreement.

#### *Cattle*

The most important concessions to Canada in the livestock field are safeguarded by tariff quotas. The dominant item is live cattle weighing 700 pounds or more per head. Under the 1936 agreement the duty on such cattle was reduced from 3 to 2 cents per pound, subject to a quota of 156,000 head. Although, during 1936 and 1937, on account of the scarcity and high prices of meat animals in the United States, the quota on cattle was filled and some additional animals entered at the statutory rate, the imports in 1938 fell far below the quota. The new agreement provides for a rate of 1½ cents per pound, and the quota has been increased to 225,000 head. The number entering at the reduced rate during any one quarter of the year, however, is limited to 60,000. This new feature will tend to prevent concentrated pressure of imports on the market. The new quota represents about 1⅓ percent of the average annual slaughter of cattle, including calves, in the United States, thus assuring to the domestic industry nearly the whole market.

Another agreement item of importance is calves. In 1936 the duty was cut from 2½ to 1½ cents per pound on a quota of 52,000 head. Actual imports exceeded the quota in 1936 and 1937, the excess paying the full statutory duty. By the new agreement the same rate is continued, but the quota is raised to 100,000 head, a small fraction of domestic slaughter. At the same time the concession has been made more favorable to Canada by raising the weight limit from 175 to 200 pounds per head.

The 1936 agreement made a maximum reduction—to 1½ cents per pound—on cows imported especially for dairy purposes. A quota of 20,000 head was fixed, but that figure has not been approached by actual imports. Consequently in renewing this concession the quota limitation has been dropped.

#### *Dairy products*

For the most part the concessions on dairy products in the new agreement are the same, or approximately the same, as those in the 1936 agreement. That agreement reduced the duty on cream from 56.6 to 35 cents per gallon, subject to a quota of 1,500,000 gallons, equal to about one-fourth of 1 percent of domestic consumption. Less than one-seventh of the quota has actually entered since. The duty has now been further reduced to 28.3 cents per gallon; the quota is unchanged. A new concession is made on whole milk, the rate

being reduced from 6½ to 3¼ cents per gallon on a quantity not to exceed 3,000,000 gallons, which is equal to less than 1 percent of the domestic production even in those regions where Canadian milk might compete. The imports for some years before 1930, when the duty was 2½ cents per gallon, averaged about 4,500,000 gallons annually.

The 1936 agreement lowered the specific duty on Cheddar cheese in original loaves from 7 to 5 cents per pound and the ad valorem minimum rate from 35 to 25 percent. Imports increased to about 10,000,000 pounds in 1936, and they supplied about 2 percent of the total consumption in this country. The gain in domestic production in the same year, however, was greater in absolute quantity than the increase in imports. In 1937 and 1938 the imports were smaller than in 1936. The further reduction of the duty to 4 cents per pound in the new agreement has been extended to other non-processed Cheddar cheese, the trade in which is very small. The ad valorem minimum rate remains at 25 percent.

On January 19 a Member of this House predicted disastrous competition for domestic cream on Canadian imports under the new trade agreement.

In the first place, the reduced duty on cream in the latest Canadian agreement was from 35 to 28.3 cents per gallon, which applies to a maximum of 1,500,000 gallons or something like one-fourth of 1 percent of the domestic consumption. In the first agreement with Canada, when the duty was reduced from 56.6 to 35 cents per gallon, what happened? In 1936, the first full agreement year, 2.9 percent of the quota, or 44,000 gallons, entered; in 1937, 9.1 percent of the quota, or 137,000 gallons, entered; in 1938, 0.3 percent of the quota, or 5,100 gallons, entered.

A good friend and colleague has personally complained to me of the reduction in the duty on Canadian hay.

In the first agreement with Canada the United States reduced the duty on hay from \$5 to \$3 per ton. In the new agreement the rate was reduced to \$2.50 per ton, which is the limit under the Trade Agreements Act. Canada reduced the duty on hay from \$5 to \$1.75 per ton. Due to the drought of 1936 there was a shortage of feedstuffs in the United States until the 1937 crops were harvested, and this accounts for the relatively large increase in imports of hay from Canada in 1937 over 1936. It might be noted, however, that the total imports of hay constitute an insignificant quantity, about two-tenths of 1 percent of the domestic production of tame hay, in 1937. Both imports and exports involve a little border trade along the international boundary. The imported hay, at the lower rates of duty, benefited farmers and dairymen at a time when their local supply was depleted.

For the first 11 months of 1938 we imported from all countries, but principally, of course, from Canada, 15,798 tons of hay, of the total value of \$119,466, which was just about one-half in tonnage what we imported in 1929 and less than one-half in value. The American hay farmer was certainly not "sold down the river" in that agreement, as the exports of hay for 1938 were from three to four times as large as the imports.

Our exports to Great Britain, colonies excluded, amounted to \$534,564,000 in 1937, and imports from Great Britain amounted to only \$202,771,000, a balance of trade in our favor of some \$330,000,000.

The agreement is particularly important because the United Kingdom is by far the principal market for American agricultural exports. Even in 1937, when, as a result of the drought of 1936, agricultural exports were much smaller than some years ago, United States exports of farm products to the United Kingdom were valued at \$261,000,000 and constituted about one-third of the exports of agricultural products to all countries of the world.

Important concessions have been secured for American farm products in the United Kingdom market. The most important of these are the abolition of the United Kingdom duties on wheat, lard, canned grapefruit, and certain fruit juices; substantial reductions in the duties on rice, apples, pears, and certain canned fruits; an increase in the quantity



of American hams permitted to enter under the quota system; and binding of duty-free entry of ham and certain other pork products; corn, other than flat white corn; and cotton.

Statistics of trade in the years immediately preceding this agreement cannot indicate fully the importance of the concessions obtained for American exports. In addition to the restrictive effect upon imports of American products of the trade barriers modified by this agreement, the scarcity of grains and meats in the United States in the last few years as a result of drought has been a factor of major importance in the reduction of American exports. The value of imports into the United Kingdom from the United States of all articles, agricultural and nonagricultural, on which concessions are obtained in the agreement—including both concessions which improve the tariff status and those which bind existing treatment against unfavorable change—was about \$300,000,000 in 1936, the latest year for which detailed statistics of imports into the United Kingdom are available. Even under the above-mentioned conditions the value of total imports into the United Kingdom of American farm products on which concessions are obtained amounted in 1936 to more than \$200,000,000.

#### Apples

While I do not have time to go into all the individual items in this summary of the agreement with Great Britain, I desire to comment briefly upon the importance of that country as a market for apples. The exports of apples from Virginia, as well as from other States, are very important. Exports of apples average between 10 and 15 percent of the commercial production. That 10 or 15 percent, if thrown back on the domestic market, would be disastrous to domestic prices. It would have far more than a 10- or 15-percent effect on prices. A 10- or 15-percent addition to the supply might even break prices by 50 percent. The percentage of exports of apples from Virginia greatly exceeds the national average, sometimes reaching a fourth of the domestic production of the State.

The United Kingdom has long been the most important foreign outlet for American fresh apples. The United Kingdom ordinarily takes about 40 percent of the United States exports. British takings of American apples were valued at \$18,938,000 in 1929. Until the establishment of empire preference in 1932, in part a retaliation against our tariff policies, the United States had been the principal shipper of fresh apples to the United Kingdom, American apples accounting for about one-half of fresh apple imports from all sources.

American apples have been dutiable at 4s. 6d. per hundredweight since November 1932, while apples of Empire origin have remained duty-free. The British concession on apples reduces the duty by one-third to 3s. per hundredweight during the period August 16 to April 15, inclusive, when the bulk of the shipments from the United States of each marketing year are made to the United Kingdom. The reduced duty is equivalent to about 16 percent ad valorem, compared with over 24 percent for the previous rate. This concession should help the American apple export trade to regain a substantial portion of its share of the British market displaced through the former 4s. 6d. duty.

The agreement with the United Kingdom is not the only country in which important concessions have been obtained for apples and other fruits. As a matter of fact, every country with which we have negotiated trade agreements, with the exception of Nicaragua, have granted concessions of one kind or another on fresh fruit. Sixteen of the countries have granted concessions on fresh apples. These countries took approximately 28 percent of the exports of apples during 1933-34 previous to any trade agreements. During 1936-37, in spite of a short American crop, these countries took 42 percent of the exports of apples. Concessions on dried fruits have been obtained in 16 or 17 of the agreements, some concessions have been obtained on canned fruit in every one of the 19 agreements.

#### WAR MATERIALS

Those who attempt to belittle the importance of trade agreements in expanding our foreign trade have spoken in a

sinister way of the exports of alleged war materials. My distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] on February 10, 1938, showed that the export of alleged war materials in 1929 amounted to \$944,000,000, or \$168,000,000 more than they did in 1937. Of course, I cannot reach any fair basis of understanding with critics of the program who are attempting to classify our exports of agricultural products as war materials. They are, of course, used during the period of war, but likewise are normal peacetime products of commerce. Germany is supposed to be building up war munitions, yet our exports to Germany in the first 11 months of 1938 were about \$13,000,000 less than in 1937. Italy is another nation that from current reports is preparing for possible hostilities. Our exports to Italy for a like period in 1938 were about \$17,000,000 less than in 1937. But the real hue and cry about the exportation of war materials relates to Japan. In a comparable period in 1937 our exports to Japan amounted to \$271,948,000 and in 1938 to \$211,051,000, a decrease of \$60,897,000, although, as I have previously pointed out, our total exports in 1938 were over \$3,000,000,000 and our favorable balance over \$1,000,000,000.

#### A COMPARISON OF METHODS

Another favorite criticism of the trade-agreement program is the alleged star-chamber proceedings. Such a charge does not come with good grace from those who rammed the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill down the throats of the Democratic Members of the House under the most drastic gag rule ever known to that body. Not even a Woodrow Wilson, who in 1912 referred to those who sat down behind closed doors to play providence to certain vested interests, could visualize a Grundy behind closed doors framing the outrageous provisions of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill.

The American Tariff League, which is a consistent opponent of trade agreements, recently asserted:

While we thoroughly disagree with some of the economic reasoning offered in justification of certain cuts in duty made in other trade agreements, we have no hesitancy in saying we know it to be true that certain types of economic presentation of interested parties have been considered and have contributed materially to the determination as to what should be done in connection with various individual products which have been under consideration.

In the negotiation of a trade agreement, the public is invited or given an opportunity to formally participate on two separate occasions. There is no limitation on the informal presentation of any pertinent material. Every opportunity is given each interested person to be fully heard, and all facts submitted to the State Department are given full and careful consideration before an agreement is negotiated. And all of these facts are likewise laid before every participating department and its advice sought before an agreement is negotiated. Compare that procedure, if you please, with the writing of the infamous Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, when the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee spent 2 months and 10 days behind closed doors deciding what to put in the bill, while the 10 Democratic members of the committee remained completely ignorant of what was going on.

The bill thus prepared was then reported, and under a rule prohibiting any amendment to be offered except a committee amendment, the House was given 4 days for consideration of the bill. Of the 10,681 lines in the Hawley-Smoot bill, only 82 were considered in the House. Of the 727 paragraphs included in the first and second sections of the bill, only 6 of them were read and considered. Of the 183 sections contained in the bill, only a small fraction of one of the sections was read and considered. There were only 4 pages of the 434 pages of the bill given any consideration. Of this procedure, Ragon, of Arkansas, a former member of the Ways and Means Committee, said:

As a fitting climax to this legislative horseplay which characterized the conduct of this bill through its consideration by the House, the Clerk read, as a part of the meager consideration of this bill, paragraph 2 \* \* \*.

A paragraph dealing with the chemical schedule.

As between a tariff bill drafted in this manner and a trade agreement drafted in accordance with the present procedure

of the State Department, only those who seek special privileges in return for special party services could prefer the Hawley-Smoot procedure.

At the outset of these remarks I referred to the importance of returning men to private employment as a safeguard against deficit financing that would ultimately lead to currency inflation. I have presented statistics showing the definite relation between foreign trade and domestic employment. I have presented statistics to show that the program has been beneficial to agriculture as well as to industry. I have endeavored to show that in the negotiation of trade agreements every precaution is taken to safeguard domestic interests. I have pointed out the utter futility of hoping for any break-down of tariff barriers by congressional action. I have cited the figures showing the tremendous increase of our foreign trade under the reciprocal trade agreement program. But I would not be willing to end the discussion of this important subject without a reference to the equally important subject of world peace. Mr. Speaker, I have convinced myself, if I have not convinced any other Member of this honorable body, that a restoration of our foreign trade will help us financially and help to save the form of government we all love. But regardless of any vote I may have cast in this body that indicated that in the approach to some of our social and economic problems I was more conservative than some of my colleagues, I have never placed material values above human values. And to me the deepest and most significant appeal of Mr. Hull's reciprocal-trade policy is its potential contribution to world peace and the saving of human lives. Human nature being what it is, we must frankly admit that those nations that lack certain essential raw products are going to get them if they can; if not by peaceful methods, then by force. And I firmly believe that a resort to the club to get what could and should be acquired by mutually beneficial trade will be the dawning for our modern civilization of a new cave-man age.

The contribution of trade agreements to the promotion of world peace has nowhere been better summarized than in the letter of September 2, 1938, from Secretary of State Cordell Hull to the Honorable John Hamilton, chairman of the Republican National Committee, wherein Mr. Hull said:

That economic armaments result in a lowering of living standards throughout the entire world; foment internal strife; and offer constant temptation to use force, or threat of force, as a means of obtaining from other nations what could have been procured through the normal processes of trade.

That a people driven to desperation by want and misery is a constant threat of disorder and chaos, both internal and external. That, to the extent that we can make it easier for ourselves and everyone else to live, we diminish the pressure on any country to seek economic betterment through war.

That the great fundamental approach to the problem of peace is the ordering of the economic life of the civilized world in a manner which will enable the masses of the people to work and to live in reasonable comfort.

That nations cannot produce on a level to sustain their populations in comfort and well-being unless there are reasonable opportunities to trade one with another.

That this cannot happen in a world of extreme economic barriers and military hostility.

For these self-evident reasons the trade-agreements program is a great cornerstone for the edifice of peace.

And on that stone, Mr. Speaker, I raise my Ebenezer.

Every woman who has gone down into the valley of the shadow of death that a new life may be brought into being, who has seen the blue of the skies mirrored in innocent eyes, who has felt chubby fingers entwined about the tendrils of her heart has a right to hope, has a right to demand that her Government will do all in its power to prevent her son from being consumed as cannon fodder.

And if there be any who wish to make of that program a political issue in 1940, I will accept the challenge. [Applause.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, if any, I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER of Tennessee). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is entitled to recognition for 20 minutes. [After a pause.] The gentleman does not seem to be present.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. DeROUEN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. HENNINGS (at the request of Mr. ROMJUE) for 10 days on account of important business.

#### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2762. An act to consolidate and codify the internal revenue laws of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

#### BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2762. An act to consolidate and codify the internal revenue laws of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House, in accordance with its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 6, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

#### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will continue Saturday, February 4, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 7, 1939. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Mr. R. V. Fletcher, of the American Association of Railroads, will be the witness.

#### COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 7, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of continuing the consideration of H. R. 2880, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," carrying out partially the recommendations of the Hepburn report.

#### COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization in room 446, House Office Building, Wednesday, February 8, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the public consideration of H. J. Res. 90 and H. R. 2200.



## COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, February 7, 1939, on the bills listed below:

H. R. 785, Draft Convention No. 53, officers' competency (BLAND); H. R. 947 (SEGER), H. R. 950 (KENNEDY), H. R. 1639 (BREWSTER), H. R. 1641 (BATES of Massachusetts), H. R. 1799 (MALONEY), H. R. 1805 (HALL), H. R. 2534 (CULKIN), H. R. 2641 (DIMOND), H. R. 3210 (CANNON of Florida), H. R. 3216 (SCHAFFER of Wisconsin), H. R. 3228 (McCORMACK), H. J. Res. 118 (SHANLEY).

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m. Tuesday, February 21, 1939, on the bill (H. R. 3576) to make effective the provisions of the Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936.

It is contemplated that the hearing on Tuesday, February 7, 1939, on H. R. 785 and related bills will deal with the exemption of vessels of less than 200 gross tons from the provisions of the treaty. The hearing on Tuesday, February 21, on H. R. 3576 will deal particularly with legislation necessary to make effective the provisions of the treaty and problems arising in connection with the provisions of the treaty.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold public hearings in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10 a. m., on the bills and dates listed below:

Tuesday, March 14, 1939:

H. R. 180, H. R. 202, construction of a Nicaraguan Canal; H. R. 201, additional facilities for Panama Canal; H. R. 2667, construction of a Mexican canal.

Tuesday, March 21, 1939:

H. R. 137, H. R. 980, H. R. 1674, relating to annuities for Panama Canal construction force.

Thursday, March 23, 1939:

H. R. 139, H. R. 141, H. R. 142, H. R. 1819, miscellaneous Panama Canal bills.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

382. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for printing and binding, Bureau of the Budget, in substitution of the estimate appearing under this head on page 648 of the 1940 Budget (H. Doc. No. 149); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

383. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year 1939, in the amount of \$3,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 148); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

384. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1940 in the amount of \$334,000 (H. Doc. No. 147); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

385. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend section 210 of the Communications Act of 1934, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1073; 47 U. S. C. 210), so as to permit communication utilities to contribute free services to the national defense; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

386. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting reports on the sale of equipment acquired during the World War; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

387. A letter from the director of the national legislative committee of the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement for the year ending December 31, 1938; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

388. A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the eighteenth annual report and a statement showing the names, titles,

and compensation of the members and employees of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

389. A letter from the the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill authorizing the transfer of United States Employment Service records, files, and property in local offices to the States; to the Committee on Labor.

390. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a recommendation for a change in the legislation authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to delegate to employees of the Department the function of issuing or promulgating certain orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

391. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill and a report in explanation of the bill to amend the Teachers' Salary Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1524) for the relief of William Andrew Johnson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1541) granting an increase of pension to James L. Phillips; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1547) granting an increase of pension to Bailey Carson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1549) granting an increase of pension to Luchen N. Patterson; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1457) granting a pension to Abijah Wombles; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1469) granting a pension to Robert Berg; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1473) granting a pension to George Thomas Webster; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1474) granting a pension to Lena P. Riddick; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1507) granting a pension to John R. Longwith; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1508) granting a pension to Thomas W. Yarbrough; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1509) granting a pension to Albert E. Wells; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1572) granting a pension to Christine Ledford; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1574) granting a pension to Hiram M. Graves; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1580) granting a pension to Dicie Overbey; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1581) granting a pension to Garfield Hampton; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1582) granting a pension to Carl D. Waters; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1585) granting a pension to Anna Dabney; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1586) granting a pension to Horace V. White; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1592) granting a pension to Spurgeon C. Portwood; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1594) granting a pension to Lizzie Wilshire; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1595) granting a pension to Belle Cannon; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1602) granting a pension to Henry A. Settle; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1605) granting a pension to Andrew J. Cross; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 1608) granting a pension to Ben Harrison Martin; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3154) to provide for the appointment and retirement of Faustin E. Werkus, of the United States Marine Corps, who served as an officer in the Garde d'Haiti; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 3272) granting an increase in retired pay to George Occhionero, first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps, retired; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 3693. A bill relating to the importation of distilled spirits for consumption at the New York World's Fair, 1939, and the Golden Gate International Exposition of 1939, and to duties on certain articles to be exhibited at the New York World's Fair, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 3694. A bill providing for the payment of employees' compensation to certain employees of the United States who have suffered or may suffer injuries not of a traumatic nature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 3695. A bill to validate settlement claims established on sections 16 and 36 within the area withdrawn for the Matanuska settlement project in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3696. A bill to exempt from the provisions of draft convention No. 53 of the International Labor Conference Treaty of 1936 all American vessels under 200 tons; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. R. 3697. A bill to repeal the authority to enter into certain foreign-trade agreements and to terminate agreements heretofore concluded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 3698. A bill to provide for the examination and survey of Irondequoit Bay, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 3699. A bill for expenditure of funds for cooperation with the public-school board at Wolf Point, Mont., for completing the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of a public-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3700. A bill authorizing the construction and equipment of a marine hospital in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 3701. A bill granting annual and sick leave with pay to substitutes in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. R. 3702. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof, approved July 3, 1926, and May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H. R. 3703. A bill to provide for conveying to the United States the land, buildings, and improvements comprising the Choctaw and Chickasaw Sanatorium and General Hospital; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. R. 3704. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 3705. A bill to authorize the acquisition, rehabilitation, and operation of the facilities for the public in Mount Rainier National Park, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. R. 3706. A bill to amend the Revenue Act of 1936 by extending the time for filing claims for refund of processing taxes to July 1, 1938; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3707. A bill relating to information with respect to compensation of corporate officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3708. A bill for the relief of the city of Leavenworth, Kans.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3709. A bill to relieve industrial, business, and other private interests from the necessity for unnecessarily duplicating information filed with Government agencies; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. THOMAS S. McMILLAN:

H. R. 3710. A bill to authorize an appropriation for construction of certain buildings at Fort Moultrie, Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLS of Louisiana:

H. R. 3711. A bill to extend Natchez Trace Parkway from Natchez, Miss., to San Antonio, Tex.; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3712. A bill to restrict the exportation of certain Douglas fir peeler logs and Port Orford cedar logs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to create a Bureau of Fine Arts in the Department of the Interior for the promotion of art and literature through the use of copyrighted and copy-rightable material and to define the powers and duties of said Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to provide that the United States extend to foreign governments invitations to participate in the Third International Congress for Microbiology, to be held in the United States during the calendar year 1939"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. Res. 80. Resolution to extend the Joint Committee on Forest Problems; to the Committee on Rules.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the



Congress of the United States to withdraw the nomination of Thomas R. Amlie to a position on the Interstate Commerce Commission (S. Res. No. 8); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Resolution No. 24, with reference to establishing a Division of Cooperatives in the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Joe Carter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 3714. A bill for the relief of Thomas P. Carnell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULKIN:

H. R. 3715. A bill granting a pension to Bessie C. Ford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOLGER:

H. R. 3716. A bill for the relief of Dr. Henry Clay Risner; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEHRMANN:

H. R. 3717. A bill for the relief of George P. Parker; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 3718. A bill for the relief of John J. Doherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 3719. A bill for the relief of Joseph Anthony Cordick; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3720. A bill for the relief of Richard Egward Mansfield; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3721. A bill for the relief of Joseph Skripecky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3722. A bill for the relief of John Braikovitch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. R. 3723. A bill for the relief of Louise Gilbert Scoville Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Carter, parents and guardians of Louise Marie Carter, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3725. A bill for the relief of Hallie Coffman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY:

H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of Charles Weisz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 3727. A bill granting a pension to Mary J. Glace; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3728. A bill granting a pension to Annie I. Ritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 3729. A bill for the relief of William Carl Laude; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3730. A bill for the relief of John G. Wynn; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. R. 3731. A bill for the relief of Paul T. Sims; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 3732. A bill for the relief of Rosalia Cataudella Di Rosa and son, Giorgio Di Rosa; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 3733. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Arthur A. Klein to the position and rank of second lieutenant in the United States Army and immediately retire him with the rank and pay held by him at the time of his discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 3734. A bill granting a pension to Lois Alton Hover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona:

H. R. 3735. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lena Perez; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. R. 3736. A bill for the relief of George Anthony Francis Olshefsky; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 3737. A bill for the relief of Edith M. Fraser; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3738. A bill for the relief of Willard Twitchell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 3739. A bill granting a pension to Mabel Forrer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3740. A bill granting a pension to Mary E. Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3741. A bill granting a pension to Eliza James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3742. A bill for the relief of the Welfare Finance Co., of Springfield, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

844. By Mr. CRAWFORD: Petition of Robert Fedwa and other residents of Clinton County, Mich., urging retention of the neutrality act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

845. Also, petition of Father F. A. Kaczmarek and a number of other residents of Saginaw, Mich., asking that the neutrality act be retained and made binding to civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

846. By Mr. GILLIE: Resolution of Henry W. Lawton Camp, No. 35, United Spanish War Veterans, Fort Wayne, Ind., urging the erection of a civic auditorium in Fort Wayne as a memorial to Gen. Anthony Wayne; to the Anthony Wayne Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

847. Also, resolution of Local No. 901, United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, urging that an auditorium be built as a memorial to Anthony Wayne in Fort Wayne, Ind., and that definite action carrying the project forward be started immediately; to the Anthony Wayne Memorial Commission; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

848. Also, petition of St. Jude Church, at Fort Wayne, and 109 residents of Fort Wayne, urging that we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

849. Also, petition of Rev. Charles Girardot of St. Joseph rectory and 385 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the acts of August 31, 1935, and of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

850. Also, petition of Rev. Joseph A. Hessian and 85 residents of Fort Wayne, New Haven, and Monroeville, urging that the general policy of neutrality be maintained under the acts of August 31, 1931, and of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

851. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of E. A. Schaff and other residents of Minoa, N. Y., favoring the continuance of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

852. By Mr. HAVENNER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to favorably consider the extension of subsection (3), section 203 (b), title II of the Federal Housing Act, for a period of 2 years commencing with July 1, 1939, and ending June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

853. By Mr. KEAN: Petition of Thomas Kincaid, president of the Holy Name Society of Our Lady of Sorrows Church, South Orange, N. J., and 700 other citizens of the Twelfth Congressional District, New Jersey, urging the Congress to

adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

854. By Mr. MICHAEL J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Guild of Catholic Lawyers, New York City, resolving that it record its vehement opposition to any repeal by the Congress of the United States either of the act of August 31, 1935, or the extension thereof by the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

855. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of 1,150 citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Patman chain-store bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

856. Also, petition of American women against communism, New York City, concerning the continuance of the Dies investigating committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

857. Also, petition of the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies of New Orleans, concerning the present neutrality act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

858. By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: Senate joint memorial No. 3 of the Senate of the Thirty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, concerning approval of the \$875,000,000 deficiency appropriation requested by Works Progress Administration and the \$1,750,000,000 requested to continue the program without any further curtailment for the next fiscal year; to the Committee on Appropriations.

859. Also, house memorial No. 1 of the House of Representatives of the Thirty-second General Assembly of the State of Colorado, concerning termination of selling of munitions and war materials by citizens of the United States to the country of Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

860. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of A. J. Ostlund and 870 other members of the Kansas Farmers Liberty League and farmers of Washington County, Kans., condemning the Agricultural Act of 1938, together with its amendments, and asking for the repeal of the act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

861. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Rev. E. A. Kickel, of Cleveland, Ohio, relative to retaining the embargo on arms to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

862. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Richmond Hill Post, No. 212, American Legion, New York, requesting that the War Department rescind its order to the Fort Totten Band in order that the band may participate as usual in Queens County affairs, and that the New York World's Fair authorities be forced to give employment to unemployed musicians; to the Committee on Labor.

863. By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, making application to the Congress of the United States to call a national convention, pursuant to the provisions of article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the said Constitution to provide for the establishment and operation of the philosophy and principles of the Townsend national recovery plan, otherwise known and described as the proposed General Welfare Act of 1937 (H. R. 4199); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

864. Also, petition of Genevieve Harrison and 56 other citizens of Marion County, Oreg., urging the passage of legislation which will diminish the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

865. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of 260 residents of the Third Congressional District, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the anti-chain-store bill (H. R. 1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

866. Also, petition of the Brooklyn Diocesan Union of the Holy Name Society, Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing lifting embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

867. Also, petition of the Second Assembly District Republican League, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging continuation of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

868. Also, petition of the American Women Against Communism, New York City, urging continuance of the Dies investigating committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

869. Also, petition of the Archdiocesan Union of Holy Name Societies of New Orleans, La., favoring the embargo on Spain and adherence to our present neutrality laws; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

870. By Mr. SCHAEFER of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. Arthur J. Fournie, of Belleville, Ill., and other parishoners of St. Peter's Cathedral Parish, Belleville, urging Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended in the act of May 1, 1937, to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

871. Also, petition of the parishoners of St. Mary's parish, Belleville, Ill., urging Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

872. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. J. E. Harper, corresponding secretary, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Chester, W. Va., protesting against the tragic personal and social demoralization caused by the manufacture, distribution, sale, and consumption of alcoholic beverages; the liquor advertising bill boards along public highways; and radio advertising of liquor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

873. By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire: Petition of citizens of Nashua, N. H., urging that for so long as the United States shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, it shall retain on its statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

874. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Borough Council of the Borough of Manasquan, Monmouth County, N. J., resolving that the adoption by the Congress of the United States of any legislation directly or indirectly asserting that the United States has sovereign title to and ownership of lands under navigable waters or any mineral deposits therein, or authorizing any suits or other proceedings by Federal officers to obtain the possession or use of such lands or mineral deposits without the payment of just compensation, is contrary to law and sound public policy, and should be opposed; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

875. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Bergen County (N. J.) Committee of the American Legion at a meeting held January 24, 1939, requesting the continuance of the Dies committee with an appropriation of additional funds for such continuance; to the Committee on Rules.

876. By Mr. VAN ZANDT: Petition of Louise A. Carpeneto and others, of Bellefonte, Pa., urging adherence by the United States to the principles of the Neutrality Act of 1935 and 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

877. By Mr. WELCH: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, memorializing Congress to favorably consider the extension of subsection (3), section 203 (b), title II, of the Federal Housing Act, for a period of 2 years commencing with July 1, 1939, and ending June 30, 1941; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

878. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Mexican Electrical Workers, Mexico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sale of elements of defense to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

879. Also, petition of Ramon Bugo, Ponce, P. R., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

880. Also, petition of the city of Cleveland, legislative department, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to providing for the observance of National Inventors' Day and National Advancement Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

881. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of certain citizens of Wellington, Kans., and vicinity, urging the introduction of a bill that will limit all railroad employees to not more than 208 hours or equivalent thereof in 1 month, and an immediate Federal investigation of the subject; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



882. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the National Research Project, Local No. 9, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the discontinuance of the un-American committee; to the Committee on Rules.

883. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Local No. 5, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the continuance of the La Follette investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

884. Also, petition of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, State Council of New Jersey, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to continuation of the House of Representatives committee investigating un-American activities; to the Committee on Rules.

885. Also, petition of the city of Mobile, Ala., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation taxing income derived from securities issued by States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

886. Also, petition of the train-service brotherhoods, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to regulation of mileage of train-service employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast made in one pure timeless thought all things at once, the last things with the first and the first life with the last: We bow before Thy inscrutable power, beseeching Thee to unfold the glimmering miracles of life's loveliness one by one, each at its destined moment; for Thy ways with us are as manifold as the number of the souls of men. We pray, then, for grace to respond with heart and mind and will to the call of duty in this high and holy service of our country; reveal to us the wisdom taught of love to understand those human needs for which the sacrament of true and lasting sympathy alone is adequate; and, that what we do here day by day may be pleasing unto Thee, grant us the sense of Thy friendship and nearness, a hand in ours, a companion on the weary way, and a light within our heart. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, February 2, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calhoun, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 to the joint resolution, and concurred therein.

### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that, under authority of the order of the Senate of the 2d instant, the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, were signed by the President pro tempore on February 3, 1939:

H. R. 2762. An act to consolidate and codify the internal-revenue laws of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LEWIS. As I observe the Senate, I assume the want of a quorum, and I suggest its absence, and ask for a roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Ellender	Lee	Russell
Andrews	Frazier	Lewis	Schwartz
Ashurst	George	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Austin	Gerry	Logan	Sheppard
Bailey	Gibson	Lucas	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gillette	Lundeen	Smathers
Barbour	Glass	McCarran	Smith
Barkley	Green	McKellar	Stewart
Bilbo	Guffey	McNary	Taft
Bone	Gurney	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Hale	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Bulow	Harrison	Miller	Tobey
Burke	Hatch	Murray	Townsend
Byrd	Hayden	Neely	Truman
Byrnes	Herring	Norris	Tydings
Capper	Hill	Nye	Vandenberg
Caraway	Holman	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Overton	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pepper	White
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	Wiley
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	
Davis	King	Reed	
Downey	La Follette	Reynolds	

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. MINTON] is detained from the Senate because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY] is detained by a slight illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is detained on important public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent in attendance on a meeting of a committee of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, which has under consideration the question of flood control.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. McNARY. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### BOARD OF VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the provisions of the act of August 29, 1916, appointed Mr. BYRD, Mr. NEELY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. LODGE members of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy.

### ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST CONGRESS—JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS ON MARCH 4, 1939

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 4, to commemorate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the First Congress of the United States under the Constitution, the Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] as members of the joint committee, on the part of the Senate, which is empowered to make suitable arrangements for the exercises of the joint session of the Congress.

### PENALTIES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF NARCOTICS, FIREARMS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the seizure and forfeiture of vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used to transport narcotic drugs, firearms, and counterfeit coins, obligations, securities, and paraphernalia, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

### SALE OF WORLD WAR NAVAL EQUIPMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the sale of equipment acquired